

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XVI

JULY, 1923

NUMBER 3

THE "SIC ET NON"¹ OF STEPHANUS GOBARUS

ADOLF VON HARNACK

UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN

IN the older, as well as in the current, books on church history, and at some points in New Testament introduction, patristics, and the history of doctrine, a certain work is referred to under the name of "Stephanus Gobarus." The problems arising out of the quotations from this book are of great interest; but we are given virtually no information about the author beyond his name, and the book itself remains a complete mystery. Only the industry of Walch, in Part VIII of his "Entwurf einer vollständigen Historie der Ketzereien" (1778, pp. 877 ff.) has analyzed it, or, ~~moreover~~, made unsatisfactory and incorrect extracts from it, to which he has added a few observations of his own. With this exception, it seems as if ever since the tenth century scholars had entered into a conspiracy to maintain complete silence about this work, or at least to content themselves with a few scanty remarks.²

In the following pages I shall endeavor to come closer to the work and its author. I do not undertake to give a commentary, for that would require a book; but shall confine myself to the main points, going into detail only with reference to passages that relate to the literature of the first three centuries.

¹ This title I have supplied. The manuscript tradition gives only the name of the author.

² Cave does not mention the writer, and there is no article on him in either the Protestant or the Catholic Realencyclopädie, or in the Dictionary of Christian Biography. In Fabricius-Harles, vol. X, p. 757, we find only a misleading list of the authors named in Photius's extracts from the work; and Krumbacher barely alludes to it. Bardenhewer (Patrologie, 2d ed., 1901, p. 479) says: "Among the famous writers of the tri-theistic party [for this 'fame' I have found no evidence, unless it be the surname 'Gobarus'] was numbered Stephanus Gobarus, about 600 [for this date there is no evidence], now known only through extracts from his chief work [but we know of no other works] in Photius."

All we know about Gobarus is contained in Codex CCXXXII of the "Bibliotheca" of Photius (ed. Bekker); at least I have not yet succeeded in finding so much as his name in any other writer.³ Since Photius's excerpts are of moderate compass, it is desirable to give them in full; and in my translation I have condensed only a few passages where Photius is unduly verbose, together with certain unimportant formal statements and others where he repeats himself. Photius's opinions, reflections, and other additions are indicated by square brackets; to him are also due the *epitheta ornantia* (ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις, ὁ μέγας, ὁ εὐλαβέστατος, οἱ ὅσοι μυσταγωγοί, οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδάσκαλοι, κ. τ. λ.) attached to the names of ancient Fathers—at any rate we have no assurance that these come from Gobarus himself.

CODEx CCXXXII

Read (ἀνεγνώσθη) the book of a certain Stephanus, a tritheist with the surname Gobarus.

[The book gives evidence of wide studies, but the result does not correspond to the great industry applied. The author evidently aimed rather at honor and fame than at usefulness. The number of chapters which he has elaborated, and which are contributions to general ecclesiastical questions, amounts to almost fifty-two; a few, more special, chapters are added to these. The general ecclesiastical chapters comprise pairs of sentences, presented not only in pairs but as contradictory; yet the sentences are not substantiated by argument or proof-texts, but merely by the utterances, as the author holds, of divergent Fathers. Of these utterances one set maintain the view of the church, the other that which the church rejects. But the wrong view is cherished only in ancient utterances, or by men of ancient times, who had not yet accurately (πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν) weighed and tested everything, and indeed by some of these it is cherished only in the mistaken opinion of the compiler.⁴ On the other hand, the view of the church is supported by the testimonies of holy men who have arrived at the truth with complete precision (οἱ μάλιστα τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐξακριβώσαντες). The chapters in which the arrangement with double or contradictory utterances presents itself are as follows:]

(1) The "idiom" and the "character" and the "form" are the "hypostasis," but not so is the combination of being and "idiom," nor the "authypostatic." [The sayings first adduced by Gobarus maintain this; those next

³ He is not found either in Leontius or in Severus (although not all the writings of Severus are accessible in print). Mention of him is lacking also in the church histories of Evagrius and of John of Ephesus (although we do not possess the whole of the latter's great work). In later writers also my search has so far been in vain. For a possible identification, see below.

⁴ That is, of Gobarus.

given, the opposite, namely that the "idiom" and the "form" and the "character" are not the "hypostasis" but the "character" of the hypostasis.]

(2) John the Baptist was conceived in October. — He was conceived in November.

(3) The conception of the Lord was announced to the Virgin in the first month, April, which the Hebrews call Nisan; and she bore our Lord Jesus Christ after nine months, that is on the 5th of January, in the middle of the night of the eighth day before the ides of January. — The Annunciation took place not in April but on the 25th of March, and our Saviour was born, not on the 5th of January but on the eighth day before the calends of January.

(4) At the resurrection we shall receive the same body in every respect which we now have, without distinctive addition in respect of incorruptibility. — We shall not receive the same body as this corruptible one.

(5) We shall rise in the same form (*σχήμα*). — We shall rise in another form.

(6) In the resurrection every one will be of the same age as at his death. — No, on the contrary even children will rise in mature form, and not rise all together but singly.⁵

(7) At the resurrection we shall receive a tenuous body, airy, ethereal, and spiritual. — No, rather one earthy, substantial, and solid (*γῆϊνον καὶ παχὺ καὶ ἀντίτυπον*).

(8) The Deity has a form and soul like man; and the phrase "in the image" refers to his bodily appearance, with reference to which man was fashioned in the semblance of the archetype⁶; and the angels have bodies like those of men; and from the being and nature of God the human soul has proceeded. — The Deity has not a form like man, neither is fashioned in a form at all; nothing of what is said above is true of him; neither are the angels corporeal beings, but are incorporeal; and the human soul does not proceed from the being and nature of God.

(9) Before the fall the human body was one thing, like a beam of light, they say; and after the fall it was another, as we have it now, a body of flesh, and this is what is meant by the "coats of skin." — The "coats of skin" do not mean our flesh.

(10) The just will rise from the dead first, and all beasts with them, and they will revel for a thousand years in eating and drinking and having children; and then will follow the general resurrection. — There is no preliminary resurrection of the just, nor any revelling for a thousand years, nor marriage.⁷

(11) After the resurrection paradise will be the abode of the just. — Not in paradise but in heaven; and paradise is neither in heaven nor on earth, but between the two.

(12) Paradise is the Jerusalem which is above, and it is in the third heaven, and the trees there are endowed with mind and have intelligence and logos, and man was thrust down thence to earth after the fall. — Paradise is not in the third heaven but on earth.

⁵ καὶ οὐκ ἄθροον πάντες, ἀλλὰ παρὰ μέρος. I am not sure about the understanding of this sentence.

⁶ That is, God.

⁷ That is, for the risen.

(13) The good things prepared for the just, eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have they entered into the heart of man. — Hegesippus, however, an ancient and apostolic man (?), says in the fifth book of his *Hypomnemata* [I do not know how he arrived at this ⁸] that this is an idle saying, and that those who say it speak falsely, since the Scriptures and the Lord say, "Blessed are your eyes, for they see, and your ears, for they hear," etc.

(14) Those sinners who are given up to punishment are thereby purified of their wickedness and after their purification freed from punishment; moreover not all those given up to punishment are purified and freed, but only some. — No one [and this is the true view held by the church] is freed from punishment.

(15) To be burned and not consumed is an indestructible self-destruction.⁹ Titus, bishop of Bostra, however, writing against the Manichees, says in his first book: "How can destruction be destruction of itself? For it destroys solely and alone something else, not itself. But if it destroyed itself, it could not have subsisted from the start; for it will destroy itself, and will not so much 'be' as 'destroy' itself, for an indestructible¹⁰ destruction is, by universal common sense, an impossible conception." [It is evident that this holy man calls "indestructible destruction" an impossibility in a different sense from that of the divinely inspired John. The latter understands by it a destruction that will last forever and will always continue, but the former thinks that destruction can not be indestructible, that is, cannot be passionlessness and indestructibility and a preserving force. Such being the relation of the two views, the author of the work before us, Gobarus, has not understood the different conceptions, and has set up the two propositions as contradictory.]

(16) The coming age¹¹ is the eighth. — It is the ninth.

(17) The body of our Saviour Jesus Christ after the resurrection was of tenuous consistency, spiritual and heavenly and light of weight and that could not be touched, and hence he could pass even through closed doors; while the palpable body, of gross consistency, is something other than that, solid and of different nature. — Our Lord Jesus, the Christ, after the resurrection had neither an impalpable body nor one of tenuous consistency, nor a spiritual body, but through his miraculous power, not because of the nature of his body, he passed through closed doors.

(18) Christ did not put off the flesh after the resurrection, but sits at the right hand of the Father in the flesh. — He will come to judge the quick and the dead not in the flesh but in a body answering to his divinity.

(19) Not in the flesh but in pure deity does the Lord come at his second advent. [Gobarus puts this as a "chapter," and adduces for it sayings of Titus, bishop of Bostra, but he neglects all the countless contrary sayings which he might have cited, mentioning none of them, and thereby, as every-

⁸ This remark is by Photius, since he never makes Gobarus speak in the first person.

⁹ I am not quite sure of the translation; τὸ καλεῖσθαι καὶ μὴ κατακαλεῖσθαι φθοράν ἐστὶν ἀφθαρτον φεῖρεσθαι.

¹⁰ And hence eternal.

¹¹ Walch (l. c. p. 881) renders ὁ μέλλον αἰὼν by "the coming century," a translation which seems to me impossible.

where, exhibits his impiousness, which, denying the flesh, shamelessly makes a dogmatic statement of "the one nature."]

(20) The body that cannot suffer and be wounded and die is of another nature and another kind than ours, and the perishable and mortal undergoes a transformation of nature when the change to imperishability and immortality befalls it.

(21) Every definition, if it is complete, preserves the nature of the things defined; but if anything is taken away from or added to the definition, the thing defined is dissolved. [These two chapters, as well as the 19th, consist of a single member, and do not contain any contrary statement.]

(22) The Logos of God is completely in the All and over the All, and it is completely in the body which it united to itself hypostatically. In a word, the being and nature of deity fills all things physically and dynamically and energetically, and pervades everything that is, by virtue of the mingling in relation to the All. — It is not so; but God is by his nature outside of the All; he is, however, in all through the powers which he possesses.

(23) Before the world came into existence God created the angels. — It is not so, rather on the first day of creation.

(24) The angels and demons have bodies. — Neither the former nor the latter have bodies.

(25) Angels and rational souls and all intelligent creatures are by nature and in the order of nature imperishable. — On the contrary, not by nature but by grace are they immortal; God alone is so by nature.

(26) The angels that came down from heaven to earth had flesh and organs of reproduction, and accompanying with the women they begat the giants and taught them arts and evil arts; but the giants, uniting themselves with beasts, begat horrible creatures in human form, and demons male and female, but those angels have their place of punishment where fire and hot springs start from the earth; and the souls of sinners become demons. — On the contrary, the fallen angels, being without flesh, did not themselves unite with the women, but through the medium of men, or rather neither themselves nor through the medium of men; and human souls do not change into demons.

(27) The heaven is spherical and revolves. — Neither is it spherical nor does it revolve.

(28) The Spirit which "brooded over the water" was the Holy Ghost. — It was not the Holy Ghost, but one of the four elements.

(29) The Lord's Day is both the eighth and the first. — It is not.

(30) Human souls are rational bodies shaped like the external corporeal form and appearance of man. — The soul is incorporeal and not subject to bodily shapes.

(31) Souls existed before the foundation of the world and descended from heaven into bodies, such as Moses and the prophets, and Socrates and Plato, and John the Baptist, and the souls of the Apostles, but especially that of the Lord. — Souls were not in heaven before they had bodies, but entered upon existence at the time of origin of the body: the body preceded, then came the soul; or rather, there is neither priority nor posteriority, but simultaneity.

(32) God formed the body of Adam from earth. — Not from earth, but from water and spirit.

(33) The breath which God breathed into Adam's face was temporal, and not, like the spirit, eternal.¹² — It was not temporal, but an immortal soul.

(34) . . . ,¹³ since man is composed of three parts, mind and soul and body, and no one of these was the inbreathed breath, but that was the Holy Ghost; and the Holy Ghost did not become soul or mind, but made the soul.

(35) Earth and water and the other elements change into fruits and plants, and food changes into flesh and sinews and other parts of the body. — The earth does not change into plants and fruits, nor food into our body.

(36) After death the soul departs neither from the body nor from the grave. — The soul does not remain with the body nor in the grave. [Here, out of numberless easily found statements, Gobarus has adduced only those of Severian of Gabala and Irenaeus.]

(37) Every originated thing is corruptible and mortal, but by the will of God it persists as if indissoluble and incorruptible. — That which is by nature corruptible cannot be incorruptible by the will of God, for whoever affirms that contradicts himself, and ascribes to the Creator that which is impossible. [For this opinion he has quoted a statement of Justin Martyr;¹⁴ but with Greek opinion on this point a conflict had arisen, and he gives a refutation from Plato, who said; "Since you have been originated, you are by no means immortal or indissoluble; nevertheless, you will not be dissolved nor partake of death, for my will is stronger, of which you have partaken." The Martyr, refuting Plato's idea, shows that Plato, in introducing the demiurge, contradicts himself, and does not bring what he says into harmonious unity; for either that which is originated must, by earlier definition, be corruptible, or else he makes a false statement who declares everything originated to be corruptible. Gobarus insists that the refutation of the Greek idea must serve also to overthrow the view of the church.]

(38) [He now returns to the propositions with one member and shows (of the whole series it is the 38th chapter) what Saint Eustathius, archbishop of Antioch, held concerning the incarnation of our Lord; then (39) what the most holy Cyril, Alexandrian high-priest, and next (40) what the doctors of the church thought about the saying, "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, neither the angels nor the Son, but the Father only," and (41) what Severus thought about it.]

(42) [He now returns to the contrasted arrangement of utterances, and presents as his 42d chapter the statements] that our Lord Jesus, the Christ, was suckled by Mary, the Mother of God, — and that he was not suckled by her.

(43) "He that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than John the Baptist." The Saviour applied this to himself. — No, to John the evangelist.

(44) Our Lord Jesus, the Christ, was crucified at the age of thirty years. — Not thirty but thirty-three. — Not thirty-three but forty. — No, neither thirty nor forty, but still older, almost fifty.

(45) When the Lord handed to his disciples the mystery of the new covenant, he ate the passover prescribed by the law. — No, he did not then eat this passover.

¹² The reading should be: *καὶ οὐχ ὡς τὸ πνεῦμα αἰώνιος* (Mss. *αἰώνιον*).

¹³ *ἔτι οὐ πρόσκαιρος ἦν οὔτε ψυχὴ, ἀλλὰ νοῦς*: corrupt text, but how emend it?

¹⁴ He refers to Pseudo-Justin, Cohortatio.

(46) The brazen serpent which Moses lifted up in the wilderness was a type of the Lord. — No, not a type, but an antitype.

(47) He who cut off the ear of the high priest's servant was Thomas. — No, it was not Thomas but Peter.

(48) In the time of the passion the Deity departed from the body of Christ. — The Deity departed neither from his soul nor from his body.

(49) The Saviour gave his blood as ransom for captive mankind to "the Enemy," since the latter had made that his condition. — On the contrary, not to "the Enemy" but to God and the Father did he offer it.

(50) Christ rose in a better and more wonderful fashion than the transfiguration on the mount. — No, at the resurrection he did not change his body to correspond to the glory due him, but showed it such as it was before his death; the former is said by Cyril, the opposite by Dionysius of Alexandria.

(51) On the 12th day of the first month Mary anointed the Lord with ointment in the house of Simon the leper; on the 13th the Lord handed to his disciples the mystical Supper; on the 14th he suffered his saving passion; on the 15th he rose from the dead; and ascended on the 16th. — No, on the 14th he ate the mystical Supper, on the 15th he was crucified, and rose on the 16th. — Not so either, but on the third day, and on Sunday, the resurrection of the Lord took place, and after forty days he ascended.

(52) From the fifth evening, when the Lord handed the mystic Supper to his disciples, his body had been sacrificed.

[So far the author has treated with few exceptions of the general teachings and questions of the church, for the most part with contrasted utterances — supplying both members of the antithesis, but framing besides a few chapters with single testimonies. From this point on, however, he takes up particular topics, eighteen in number:]

(1) What the views of Severus were on the mystagogues of the church; and (2) what his attitude was in his letter to Thomas, bishop of Germanicia, toward what had been said by Cyril and John of Antioch; and (3) that he did not approve the utterances of St. Gregory, bishop of Nyssa, on the apokatastasis, nor (4) Papias, bishop of Hierapolis and martyr, nor (5) Irenaeus, the saintly bishop of Lyons, in so far as these assert that the kingdom of heaven consists in the enjoyment of certain material foods.

(6) Basil, the saint, in many passages does not approve of St. Dionysius of Alexandria, especially in so far as he¹⁵ leans toward the party of the Arians.¹⁶ Yet he apologizes for him as not moved by impious purpose, but as having been brought, by arguing against Sabellius, to the expression of bad views in the opposite direction; also he says that his language concerning the Spirit is not perfectly correct. (7) But the great Athanasius also makes a strong defense of Dionysius: "Dionysius," he says, "neither at any time held the views of Arius nor failed to see the truth; for neither was he charged with impiety by other bishops, nor did he use Arian language in his teaching." (8) But Theodoret too said the same of him.

¹⁵ That is, Basil.

¹⁶ *μάλιστα δὲ ἐν οἷς τὸ Ἀριανῶν ἔθνος ἐπερείδεται*. I am not sure of the translation I have given; *τῷ ἔθνει* would be expected.

(9) In addition he adduces testimonies as to the attitude of Theophilus and his synod toward St. John Chrysostom, (10) and what view Atticus and (11) Cyril took of this holy man; (12) what opinions the very discreet Isidore of Pelusium held concerning the Alexandrian bishops and St. John Chrysostom, how he complained of the former for his hatred of Chrysostom, but praised and admired the latter. (13) Severus, starting out to blame St. Isidore but having no good grounds, invented the charge of "Origenism," but again, convinced of the truth, withdrew it of his own accord.

(14) Further, the opinions of Hippolytus and Epiphanius concerning Nicolaus, one of the seven deacons, and their severe charges against him. Ignatius Theophorus,¹⁷ however, Clement, author of the *Stromata*, Eusebius Pamphili, and Theodoret of Cyrus, while they bring charges against the Nicolaitan sect, declare that Nicolaus himself was not a man of that kind.

(15) Hippolytus and Irenaeus say that the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews is not by him, but Clement and Eusebius and many other theophoric fathers count it in among his other epistles and say that the aforesaid Clement translated it from the Hebrew.

(16) The great Athanasius of Alexandria approved Origen and Theognostus in many points of doctrine, Titus of Bostra does the same, and the theologian Gregory in his letters calls Origen "friend of beauty and goodness," and he of Nyssa brings him to remembrance with praise. But also Dionysius of Alexandria praises him in a letter addressed to him, as well as in a second letter, after Origen's death, to Theotecnus, bishop of Caesarea. And Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem and martyr, likewise in a letter to Origen, becomes most friendly. Theophilus and Epiphanius detest Origen.

(17) The opinion of the most holy Hippolytus on the sect of the Montanists, and that of St. Gregory of Nyssa.

[The above comprise the more special chapters. Once more he turns to a more general question, and cites statements on the theme] (18) that every departed soul has great advantage from the prayers and sacrifices and alms offered in his behalf; — on the contrary that it does not.

[As far as this we find that Gobarus brought his work.]¹⁸

¹⁷ Pseudo-Ignatius.

¹⁸ While the numbers 1-52 are certain (since Photius counted up the total, and in one instance [38] has given the number of the chapter), in the second half of the book the reader is in doubt as to how to arrive at the number 18 given by Photius. The system adopted above for numbering the single pieces is not satisfactory, but I can find no better one. The surmise that chapters were here missing, I have considered, and rejected.

§ 1. *The Person and Work of Gobarus*

Photius appears to know the author only from the work from which he presents excerpts (Στέφανός τις). The surname Gobarus bids us seek the author in Syria; at least he must have been held in repute among Syrian Monophysites; for the word is not Greek, and may probably be traced back to *gebar* (meaning 'man,' 'hero').¹⁹

The express designation of the author as a "tritheist" Photius may have derived from the work itself; but this is not evident from his excerpts.²⁰ The designation makes it certain that the terminus a quo for the date of the work is to be set not long before the middle of the sixth century. The authors whom Gobarus quotes in his work²¹ afford no certain indication of the province in which Gobarus worked and wrote. Walch (l. c., p. 883) feels justified in reckoning him among Egyptian teachers, "since he seems best acquainted with the Alexandrian controversies and church fathers." The observation is correct, but whether it suffices to determine the locality will have to be investigated.

It is evident from the whole nature and learned attitude of the book that Gobarus was what was called both in the sixth century and at other times a 'grammaticus.' It is possible indeed that the surname 'Gobarus' may be explained by this fact; perhaps it meant 'doctor irrefragabilis.'²² In a search among the countless 'Stephani' with whom ours might be identified, Stephan Bar Sudaili is certainly not to be considered, because of his date and his peculiar doctrine; on the other hand it is tempting to suggest an identification with the Alexandrian sophist, Stephanus Niobes, the extreme Monophysite, concerning whom we have a certain amount of information from

¹⁹ Nevertheless the 'o' is not satisfactorily explained.

²⁰ Yet the designation may have been based on I, 1. (References to the fifty-two chapters of Gobarus's first, and "general," series are denoted by I; those to the eighteen chapters of his second, and "more special," series by II.)

²¹ Photius has named comparatively few of these in his extracts.

²² Gobarus's reputation must, however, have been limited to a local circle; otherwise he and his work could not have remained in such obscurity.

Timotheus and Dionysius Telmaharensis,²³ and who worked in the last third of the sixth century.²⁴ But since the surnames are different and cannot be identified without violence, since furthermore no positive testimonies support the identification, and since it cannot be certainly proved that Gobarus thought precisely as did his namesake in matters of christology (even though I, 19 does suggest this), this identification is probably inadvisable.

The work from which Photius quotes bore no title — otherwise he would have mentioned it; moreover it contained nothing as to its purposes, and these are not obvious at first glance. Was it perchance mutilated at the beginning and perhaps also at the close? The latter as well as the former is abrupt, and Photius seems to have felt the abrupt conclusion (τὸν μὲν οὖν Γόβαρον μέχρι τούτων τῶν κεφαλαίων τὸν πόνον εὔρομεν ἀναδεξάμενον). But if he had been dealing with a doubly mutilated work, he would have so stated. Everything is explained if we assume that Photius had before him not a book from the hand of the author himself, but a compilation by another, possibly a disciple of Gobarus, who made this collection for himself and others on the basis of the master's lectures or disputations, perhaps with the latter's knowledge. This hypothesis is supported by the observation that, so far as we know, this unique work remained unnoticed down to Photius, while on the contrary one would have expected it to create the greatest sensation; and is confirmed by the lack of orderly arrangement which we observe in it.²⁵ To be sure, disorder is by no means unfamiliar in the literature of question and response, nor is it surprising there, because the questions were answered as they came; in this work, however, the questions obviously serve a single definite purpose and are put by the author himself, or rather

²³ For Dionysius Telmaharensis consult Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, II, pp. 72 ff.

²⁴ Cf. Walch, I. c., pp. 778 ff.; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, II. (2d ed), pp. 575 f.; Krüger, *Protestantische Realencyklopädie*, XIII, pp. 400 f. He became the founder of the Niobites (Adiaphorites), who attributed to Christ in the strictest sense only one nature.

²⁵ In some places cognate material is grouped together; but this is the exception rather than the rule.

they are not questions and answers at all, but theses and antitheses. Why then this lack of order? Or is the disorder purposed? Did Gobarus mean thereby to indicate that he could at will dip into the tradition and always find what he sought?

One further observation must be noted. Photius states at the outset that the work embraces about fifty-two chapters in theses and antitheses relating to general ecclesiastical controversies, — “about,” because a few chapters of more special content (*μερικώτερα*) are appended. Photius does not number the chapters; but there are in fact fifty-two. Yet in fact, after the fifty-second chapter, he quite unexpectedly informs us that there are eighteen further special chapters (*ιδικά κεφάλαια*), and gives excerpts from these also. Did he fail to notice these in the beginning? We have no light on the matter.²⁶ Photius’s distinction, however, between general ecclesiastical controversies and special questions (which does not coincide with the other distinction between two-membered and one-membered chapters) is merely imposed externally upon the work, although according to Photius it is intended to explain the plan of the two parts. For, as Photius himself remarks, the first part contains not only several one-membered sections, but also numerous *ιδικά κεφάλαια*, and the second part has a chapter (No. 18) dealing with a general ecclesiastical controversy. The distinction between the two parts — though it is not carried through consistently — lies rather in the fact that the second part contains numerous personally determined problems, including (1) a group of Severus’s judgments upon older church fathers, and (2) contradictory judgments of the fathers on Dionysius of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Origen, the Nicolaitans, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Montanists. To these there are no parallels in the first part.

Since the work from which Photius made excerpts was probably not edited by the author himself; since it has no title; since it makes no direct statement of its purposes; since Photius likewise gave no account of these purposes; and, finally, since in the excerpts of the first and more extensive part it is

²⁶ On the great difficulty in the numbering here see what has been said above.

hardly ever stated which church fathers supported the thesis and which the antithesis, or on which side the author himself stands, it is uncommonly hard to reach a satisfactory notion of the author's purpose and of the man himself.

§ 2. *Theological and Philosophical Position*

To determine the theological position of Monophysite teachers of the sixth century is well known to be difficult, for the subject of christology had become extremely complicated. It was weighted down with theological, trinitarian, cosmological, anthropological, and eschatological questions, and the combinations led to differences of position, even with theologians who were on the main question not far apart. A teacher could thus stand on the extreme right in one group of questions and in others be "liberal." We must be constantly on our guard here against an undue requirement of "consistency."

In his introduction to the work of Gobarus Photius remarks that, of the theses and antitheses, one always contains the ecclesiastical view, the other, the view to be rejected. This assertion is misleading, both because in many cases there was no "ecclesiastical" view of the problem in question, and because it is often hard to say which the ecclesiastical view is. And it is very often obscure what Gobarus's own view is. The hypothesis that it is always the thesis or always the antithesis that contains his theology, breaks down; indeed, a careful reading speedily leads to the suspicion that in many chapters he was interested in neither the thesis nor the antithesis, but solely in the contradiction itself. The difficulty of discovering his own theological position from such evidence is plain.

Nevertheless it is possible to reach some clear conclusions with regard to Gobarus's theology and christology:

1. Photius terms him a "tritheist."
2. The famous Monophysite Severus was an authority of first rank for Gobarus. In I, 41 Gobarus sets his interpretation of the saying, "But of that day and hour," etc., over against that of all other teachers, whom Photius calls "the doctors of the church" (that is, the Chalcedonians). In II, 1-5 Gobarus

gives Severus's judgments on "the holy mystagogues of the church,"²⁷ and on Cyril of Alexandria, John of Antioch, Gregory of Nyssa, Papias, and Irenaeus; for no other teacher has he shown such clear preference. He does, to be sure, in II, 13 admit a change of opinion on the part of Severus, but he remarks that it came about δι' ἐαυτοῦ, and so is not to the discredit of the great teacher, since he allowed himself to be conquered by the truth.

3. II, 13, however, proves that Gobarus was no Origenist,²⁸ and that consequently in the Origenistic controversies he is not to be reckoned among the apologists of the famous theologian. He even considers it a reproach to be an Origenist.²⁹

4. Chapters I, 19, 20, with one member each, show that in regard to the body of Christ Gobarus taught "that the immortal body of Christ, incapable of suffering or of being wounded, is of another nature and another kind than ours, further that Christ will come again, not in the flesh, but on the contrary in pure deity, and finally that the perishable and mortal (i.e. our flesh), will undergo an essential transformation when the change to imperishability and immortality befalls it." In connection with the second of these statements Photius remarks that in support of it Gobarus has adduced only sayings of Titus of Bostra, neglecting the countless contrary sayings, "here, as everywhere, revealing his impiousness, which by shamelessly and dogmatically denying the flesh gives expression to 'the one nature.'" Evidently Gobarus represents the same view as the Emperor Justinian, Stephanus Niobes, and others with reference to the incorruptibility of Christ's body and its merely relative homogeneousness with our body (first statement), and further the doctrine of Johannes Philoponus that everything created (including the human body) really perishes, being φθαρτόν, and attains imperishability only through an essential transformation (re-creation), as

²⁷ This designation is due to Photius, not to Gobarus; what men are actually meant is uncertain.

²⁸ From II, 16 this is not evident.

²⁹ This inference is to be drawn also from II, 3-5: in matters of eschatology Gobarus took a correct intermediate position, rejecting both apocatastasis and chiliasm.

set forth in the third statement.³⁰ By I, 37 the doctrine of Gobarus is made still clearer. Following Pseudo-Justin (*Co-hortatio* 23) in his polemic against Plato (*Timaeus* 41 B) — whom he misunderstands — he asserts that God by his will can not make imperishable the naturally perishable, even God's omnipotence being powerless in the face of this contradictory antilogy. A real re-creation is necessary — exactly as Philoponus teaches.

5. Gobarus was an Aristotelian; for (a) the proof that in spite of the doctrine just sketched the resurrection of the body can nevertheless be held could only be successfully advanced by the means of Aristotelian philosophy; (b) the chapters I, 21 and 37 (likewise I, 1 and 15) reveal this philosophy clearly, and the whole work (including its tritheism) dwells in the cool scientific atmosphere of Aristotle.³¹

6. The affinity with Philoponus having been established — by tritheism, by the doctrines of the body and the resurrection, and by Aristotelianism, we recall the fact that this teacher composed a work *Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα* with the purpose of proving, on the basis of the Gospel of John, that the mystical Supper was not the passover supper, but that it took place on the 13th day of the month and that Jesus was crucified on the 14th. With this I, 45b, 51a, (52) should be compared; we see that on this question, too, Gobarus agreed with Philoponus.

7. On the basis of I, 19, 20, we may also claim I, 4b, 5b, 7a, 10b, 17a, 18b, 48b, 50a, as representing the opinion of Gobarus. This makes his theological position still clearer.

It thus appears that as a philosopher Gobarus was an Aristotelian, as a theologian he stood very close to Philoponus, but also to that other famous Monophysite, Severus, whose position was markedly different from that of Philoponus. Origen he rejected. It is worth mentioning that Photius did not repudiate as heretical any of the fathers cited by Gobarus. The latter,

³⁰ See Walch, l. c., VIII, pp. 771 ff., Schönfelder, *Die Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus*, 1862, pp. 301 ff., *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, III, pp. 425 ff. The controversy as to the resurrection ended about the year 582.

³¹ The preference for Titus of Bostra (I, 15, 19; II, 16) likewise certainly results from the latter's Antiochian and rational, Aristotelian character, as does perhaps the preference (if one may call it such) for Severian of Gabala (I, 36).

although a Monophysite, must have succeeded in giving his work such a form that Chalcedonian orthodoxy could not completely reject it. But, as is well known, the "heresy" of Monophysitism was a ticklish thing in the Eastern Empire in the sixth century.

§ 3. *The Date of the Work*

From Photius's introduction it appears that Gobarus cited "ancient" and "later" fathers. So far as we can judge from the excerpts, the oldest were Ignatius (but it is Pseudo-Ignatius that is cited), Hegesippus, Irenaeus, and Clement of Alexandria; the latest was Severus of Antioch, a leader of the Monophysites.³² Since Severus figures as an authority side by side with the ancient fathers, he cannot have been still alive; his death falls about the year 540. But this date brings us no new information beyond what has been established above, namely, that the terminus a quo is to be set shortly before the middle of the sixth century. Let us look further.

1. The teacher upon whom Gobarus is most dependent, Philoponus, was not mentioned by name in the work. That may be definitely affirmed; for if Photius had found this man in Gobarus among the "fathers," he would, with his deep repugnance to "Mataioponus" (see Photius, *Bibl.* LV, LXXV, XXI, XXIII), have animadverted upon this. Nor may it be asserted that Gobarus failed to mention Philoponus because the latter passed with Chalcedonian orthodoxy as a heretic, for not until much later, at the sixth Council, was he condemned as such. We can only infer that Philoponus was not mentioned by Gobarus because he was still alive.³³ Since Philoponus attacked the patriarch of Constantinople, Johannes Scholasticus (565-577), he was certainly still living about the year 570. Hence our work is to be assigned to the period ca. 540 to ca. 570 (or even later).³⁴

³² That Photius did not reject Clement is not surprising. Thomas of Germanicia, Severus's letter to whom is mentioned in II, 2, was banished in 520 under Justin I as a Monophysite. He died in exile at Samosata about 541. Severus's letter to him is preserved (Wright, *Catalogue*, pp. 730, 567).

³³ Philoponus's literary activity began at latest in the year 529.

³⁴ The obscurity which long covered the date of Philoponus has been dispelled by

2. Gobarus regarded Origenism (II, 13) as an actual heresy. This renders it probable that he wrote after the fifth Council, and presumably brings the terminus a quo for our work to the years 553-ca. 570 (ca. 580?).³⁵

3. It is striking that no reference to tritheism is made in the work (unless perhaps in I, 1 ?), while nevertheless the sole theological characterization which Photius makes of Gobarus is "tritheist." Now it will appear in the sequel that the chief intent of the work was to overthrow church tradition as such. In a Monophysite who revered Severus and claimed to be a conservative this purpose can have been evoked only by some strongly felt dogmatic aim (or by some burning ecclesiastical question of the day). No aim of that kind is to be gathered from the work itself; hence the probability that Gobarus's purpose was the defence of tritheism *by overthrowing tradition in general*, and that for this reason he said nothing of tritheism itself. In that case the work probably belongs to the time of Justin II (565-578).³⁶ This dating combines excellently with the one given above, and we thus gain for our work the date 565-ca. 570, or, in case Philoponus attained a very advanced age and Gobarus took part in the earliest stages of the tritheistic controversy, 553-ca. 580. The date ca. 600, given in many books,

recent investigations (Ritter, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, VI, pp. 501 ff.; Stöckl, in *Wetzer and Welte, Kirchenlexikon*, VI, columns 1748 ff.; *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, p. 426). Nevertheless the year of his death can be given only approximately. The tradition that he was still alive in the first quarter of the seventh century as a contemporary of Georgius Pisides or of the emperor Heraclius is incompatible with the certainly determined dates.

³⁵ For the course of the Origenistic controversies see Diekamp, *Die Origenistischen Streitigkeiten im 6. Jahrhundert und das 5. allgemeine Konzil*, 1899; and Jülicher's review, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1900, No. 6.

³⁶ Cf. Schönfelder, l. c., pp. 267 ff. ("der Tritheistenstreit"; the author has paid scant attention to chronology); *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, p. 426. The beginnings of the Aristotelian-tritheistic movement (Askusnages) fall in the first half of Justinian's reign, and Philoponus taught his tritheism before 550, but only under Justin II did matters develop into a public controversy which agitated the church, and into that memorable disputation between the two groups of Monophysite teachers (the tritheists and the antitritheists) which the orthodox patriarch of Constantinople, Johannes Scholasticus, held by order of the emperor (Photius, *Bibliotheca* XXIV; *Evagrius*, H. E., v. 4). By a chance coincidence one spokesman of the antitritheistic party was named Stephanus.

lacks, so far as I know, all foundation. Of the dogma of energies and wills, which came to the front as early as about 600, no trace is found in the work. It remains surprising that our book is not mentioned in the work of John of Ephesus; but it has already been remarked that we are but imperfectly acquainted with John's work and that the work of Gobarus was probably not "edited."³⁷

§ 4. *Plan, Contents, and Purpose of the Work*

The peculiar character of the work resides in the fact, first, that it shows little trace of arrangement and order; secondly, that it does not contain a statement of its purpose; thirdly, that according to Photius's testimony the author refrained both from dogmatic reflections and from citing biblical proof-texts; and, fourthly, that he merely put together citations from the church fathers, usually in theses and antitheses. Which church fathers Gobarus cited, almost entirely eludes our inquiry so far as the first and larger part of the work is concerned, for in only a few places has Photius named them in his short excerpts. In I, 13, he mentions Hegesippus's *Hypomnena*; in I, 15, 19, Titus of Bostra (*Against the Manichees*); in I, 36, Severian of Gabala and Irenaeus; in I, 37, Pseudo-Justin (*Cohortatio*); in I, 38-41, Eustathius of Antioch, Cyril of Alexandria, "the doctors of the church," Severus of Antioch; in I, 50, Cyril and Dionysius of Alexandria. In these few cases the mention of the names had its motive in special considerations in the mind of Photius. In the second and shorter part, the situation is different. Here all the fathers whom Gobarus cited are named by Photius, except

³⁷ Where Gobarus is to be looked for, remains problematical. Statistically a preponderance of references in the citations relate to Alexandria in Egypt; but since almost all these cases relate to great ecclesiastical persons and actions (Origen, Dionysius, Athanasius, Theophilus, Cyril), and since we do not know whether Gobarus's citations are at first or second hand, the result is after all a non liquet. Nevertheless the interest in Isidore of Pelusium inclines the balance in favor of Egypt, and the close relationship to Philoponus supports this conjecture. On the other hand, the surname Gobarus points to Syria, as has been said above. The question is of slight importance, for the reason that in the second half of the sixth century the Syrian and the Alexandrian Monophysites maintained an intimate intercourse with one another, and there were always many Syrians in Alexandria.

in II, 18. He had to name them here, because it was a matter of *ἰδικὰ κεφάλαια*.³⁸

It therefore remains obscure on what scale, or with what thoroughness, Gobarus adduced citations from the church fathers in the first part. But if his procedure was here as thorough as in II, 14 (concerning the Nicolaitans), we must form a very favorable judgment of his erudition, for in this instance he has mentioned with approximate completeness all the fathers who in any way came into consideration on this question. And Photius in his introduction has paid tribute to the author's industry.

³⁸ The Catalogue of Fabricius-Harles has confused the fathers (and other persons) actually quoted by Gobarus and those only mentioned in his citations, with the result of a distorted image. In the following paragraphs the two groups are distinguished.

(a) Fathers cited by Gobarus (whether at first or second hand cannot be determined):

Alexander of Jerusalem (probably taken from Eusebius's Church History), II, 16

Athanasius, II, 7, 16

Atticus of Constantinople, II, 10

Basil, II, 6

Clement of Alexandria, II, 14, 15 (probably quoting from Eusebius)

Cyril of Alexandria, I, 39, 50 and II, 11

Dionysius of Alexandria, I, 50 and II, 16

"The doctors of the church," I, 40

Epiphanius, II, 14, 16

Eusebius of Caesarea, II, 14, 15

Eustathius of Antioch, I, 38

Gregory of Nazianzus, II, 16

Gregory of Nyssa, II, 16, 17

Hegesippus, I, 13

Hippolytus, II, 14, 15, 17

Pseudo-Ignatius, II, 14

Irenaeus, I, 36, 44 and II, 15

Isidore of Pelusium, II, 12

Pseudo-Justin, I, 37

Severian of Gabala, I, 36

Severus of Antioch, I, 41 and II, 1-5, 13

Theodoret, II, 8, 14

Theophilus of Alexandria, II, 9, 16

Titus of Bostra, I, 15, 19 and II, 16.

The Apostle John is cited in I, 15 and 43, as are the Apostles Peter and Thomas in I, 47, John the Baptist in I, 2, the Mother of God in I, 3 and 42, and another Mary in I, 51. Photius says in his introduction that for the "non-ecclesiastical" half of his sentences Gobarus had cited only (?) ancient fathers¹as²authorities³(in accordance with

With reference to their subject-matter the chapters may be divided into the following groups:

- (1) Christology and the life of Jesus, I, 1-3, 17-20, 22, 38-52.
- (2) The doctrine of the resurrection and eschatology, I, 4-7, 10-16, 36, 37; II, 18.
- (3) The doctrine of the being of God, of man, and of creation, I, 8, 9, 23-35.
- (4) Logic, I, 21.
- (5) Judgments on men of the church, and on controversies connected with their names, and related matters, II, 1-17.

The classification under the first three groups as given above is, however, modern, and hardly in accord with the views of Gobarus himself, for in all three are included chapters which in the view of that age were closely related, treating as they do the question as to the nature and mutual relation of the divine and the human, of the psychical and the corporeal, of the celestial and the earthly, of the uncreated and the created, of

contemporary use of language he means pre-constantinian fathers). Thus we should probably have had many other citations from lost ancient writings, as well as that from Hegesippus, if Photius's excerpt were more detailed. As it is, we can only show that of pre-constantinian fathers Gobarus cited Hegesippus, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Alexander of Jerusalem, Hippolytus, and Dionysius of Alexandria (besides Pseudo-Ignatius and Pseudo-Justin).

- (b) Fathers and other persons mentioned in Gobarus's citations:

Bishops of Alexandria, II, 12
 Clement of Rome, II, 15
 Dionysius of Alexandria, II, 6-8
 Gregory of Nyssa, II, 3
 Irenaeus, II, 5
 Isidore of Pelusium, II, 13
 John of Antioch, II, 2
 The Montanists, II, 17
 "Mystagogues of the church," II, 1
 Nicolaus and the Nicolaitans, II, 14
 Origen, II, 13 and 16
 Papias, II, 4
 Sabellius, II, 6
 Theognostus, II, 16
 Theotecnus, II, 16
 Thomas of Germanicia, II, 2.

Furthermore, Socrates, I, 31; Plato, I, 31 and 37. In I, 31 Moses, the prophets, Socrates, Plato, John the Baptist, and the Apostles are cited together. The Epistle to the Hebrews is mentioned in II, 15.

the imperishable and the perishable. If we allow to this question the extraordinary latitude that it possessed in the cosmological and the nearly related christological speculation of the time, then the following chapters belong more or less closely together: I, 1, 4-15, 17-20, 22-26, 28-43, 48, 50 (probably also 45, 51, 52, and the chapter on logic, I, 21). Thus in the first part only eight chapters³⁹ remain which no art can contrive to subordinate to that main topic, viz., I, 2, 3, 16, 27, 44, 46,⁴⁰ 47, and 49. To these are to be added the seventeen κεφάλαια ἰδικά of the second part, together with chapter II, 18.

With reference to these twenty-six pieces of utterly varied content there can be no doubt that Gobarus adduced them solely for the purpose of showing how the church fathers contradict each other; for what other motive can be discovered for this juxtaposition of unrelated topics? With reference, however, to the forty-four first-mentioned pieces it is equally beyond doubt that, parallel with the main interest of discrediting tradition by laying bare its contradictions, a second interest was present. The author desired, namely, to enounce the Aristotelian-Monophysite conception (represented by Philoponus) of the relation of the uncreated to the created (of the indestructible to the perishable), and so to give expression to the appropriate doctrine of the incarnation and of the *one* nature of the Redeemer (with special reference to his body).⁴¹ Photius himself reproaches Gobarus here with partisan choice of his witnesses and with misunderstanding (I, 15, 19, 36, 37).⁴²

³⁹ For even such a question as, for instance, that mentioned in I, 42, whether Mary suckled the Lord or not, is in the last analysis not only a question touching Mary (virginitas post partum), but also a question pertaining to the problem of the incarnation and the relation of the divine to the human. Similarly some mystery is certainly concealed behind I, 43, and at the bottom of the passover problem (I, 45, 51, 52) lies ultimately the problem of the body of Christ, and behind this the problem of the imperishable and the perishable.

⁴⁰ Back of these two also may have lain for the author a problem of metaphysical christology.

⁴¹ This is shown in particular by the chapters in which Gobarus has given theses only, without antitheses.

⁴² If Gobarus had been guided exclusively by the purpose of discrediting tradition, it would remain obscure why in two-thirds of the cases he selected the contradictory utterances of tradition from a single field, however extensive.

The aims of the work are thus disclosed. In an ecclesiastical controversial question — presumably that of tritheism — the tritheist Gobarus, confronted by the very embarrassing appeal of his opponents to the authority of tradition,⁴³ resorted to the violent expedient of discrediting tradition itself, and in the process he gave vigorous expression to his Aristotelian-Monophysite theology and christology.

The work of Gobarus is unique in the whole literature of the Greek church. When one considers what tradition signifies in the Greek church, and that the whole dogma is built up on traditional proof,⁴⁴ the boldness of Gobarus is amazing. From

⁴³ In the second century there were indeed highly esteemed fathers who were tritheists; but they did not intend to be such — and they were subordinationists. The tritheists of the sixth century had great difficulty in maintaining their ground in the face of tradition.

⁴⁴ See my *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, II (4th ed., 1909), pp. 84 ff. Even so cautious a work as the *Commonitorium* of Vincent of Lerinum could not have been written in the East, for the idea of tradition was even more rigid here than in the West. Even the greatest theologian of the East and father of theological science in the Greek church took his stand firmly on the ground of ecclesiastical tradition. No one was permitted to depart from it. When the great Cappadocians were forced to recognize that there was no certain proof from tradition for the orthodox doctrine of the Holy Ghost, they invented for this doctrine a *παράδοσις ἄγραφος*, being unable to believe that a tradition could be lacking. From the fifth century on the proof from tradition became the most important proof, for the biblical and the speculative proof yielded precedence to it. In the controversy that lasted for centuries between the orthodox party and the Monophysites and between the Monophysites among themselves, proof from tradition dominated all endeavors. Ere long mutual recrimination naturally broke out, with charges of partisan bias in the selection of evidence, of the misinterpretation, and even the falsification and invention of evidence. Thus Philoponus was reproached (Photius, *Bibliotheca* LXXV) with misusing for his tritheism the utterances of the fathers, in particular of Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil, Athanasius, and Cyril; John of Ephesus tells us (*Church History* v. 10) that the tritheists had “put together a great book out of the living body of those writings of the holy fathers which they supposed to confirm and corroborate their heresy.” “That,” says John, “is what the law forbids: ‘That which is torn with beasts he shall not eat’ (Lev. 22, 8). So they too tore away dead members out of the discussions (arguments) of the holy fathers, thinking to prove that these likewise taught and enounced a number of deities and many gods, like the heathen.” Especially interesting is the story told of Severus of Antioch (in Anastasius, *Hodegos* 6). It is said that in order to escape from the patristic proof-passages quoted by his opponents, which he was not able to refute, he repudiated these passages as forgeries in his work “*Philalethes*” (against John of Caesarea). This work was so highly esteemed by his adherents that they placed it even above the Gospel of John, and accepted only such utterances of the fathers as Severus had approved.

the time of the heretic Marcion no one in the church had undertaken any such thing. It was precisely in the tritheistic controversy that the chief rôle was played by proof from the testimonies of the fathers ⁴⁵ — and just at that moment Gobarus wrote his “*Sic et Non*,” and uncovered the contradictions to be found in the works of the most celebrated church fathers.

How did he come to do it? Where did he get the courage and the capacity for such an undertaking? It is to be remembered that since the end of the fifth century Aristotelianism had regained ascendancy in learned study. Gobarus believed in the controlling significance of *ratio* and dialectic, looked with scorn upon the traditionalists, and believed himself able to dispense with their weapons. This is where Gobarus belongs; but he alone among the teachers of the church was consistent. The others clung to the principle, “*ratio et autoritas*”, but Gobarus took his stand on *ratio* alone, and annihilated tradition. How much this meant in that age, we can scarcely realize today. Nor do we know whether Gobarus made his murderous book accessible to wider circles or only communicated it to friends and disciples; the boldest are not always the most courageous, and we hear nothing of a controversy, and consequently nothing of a success. The further fact is important, and shows his caution, that he formulated no conclusions; he simply let the facts speak for themselves by placing them side by side in the form of theses and antitheses. Thus he remained protected as to his own person, and further proved his caution by not exposing himself to criticism in the collection and combination of his patristic citations. Photius has scarcely anywhere found occasion to reproach him with partisanship, still less with untrustworthiness or falsification. He assumed the mask of a calm “reviewer,” but who can doubt that he intended to discredit tradition in all fields by demonstrating its contradictions with reference to the doctrines of God and Christ, of the perishable and the imperishable, of heaven, paradise, and hell, of the Bible, history, and chronology?

⁴⁵ Cf. the preceding note.

Many things have been repeated in history, including the history of ecclesiastical thought; but so perfect a parallel as that between Abaelard, with his work "*Sic et Non*,"⁴⁶ and Gobarus and his nameless work is not likely to be found again. In one hundred and fifty-eight chapters Abaelard, *without adding anything or drawing conclusions of his own*, combines theses and antitheses in reference to the most varied doctrines — with precisely the same purpose as Gobarus, to undermine the authority of tradition and so clear the way for the royal *ratio*, that is, for doubt and science (*Wissenschaft*). But it was because at the opening of the twelfth century the situation of thought was much like that of the sixth century, that this second Gobarus then appeared. Since the middle of the eleventh century Aristotelianism with its *ratio* and its confidence in dialectic had again been on the scene, opposing the musty "science" that relied on tradition, exactly as it had opposed it in the sixth century in the person of Gobarus.⁴⁷ The only difference is that Abaelard placed at the head of his work a "Preface" which is a masterpiece of courage and shrewdness, and at the same time a supreme achievement of mediaeval thought.⁴⁸

That Abaelard was ignorant of the work of Gobarus makes their agreement the more striking,⁴⁹ and serves to enhance confidence in the conclusion that in the two cases alike the inner logic of the development of events has led through the inter-

⁴⁶ Petri Abaelardi "*Sic et Non*" primum integrum ed. Henke et Lindenkohl, 1851.

⁴⁷ Hence the judgment upon the work: "*aeternis tenebris potius dignum quam luce*" (Martène et Durand, *Thesaurus nov. anecdotorum*, V, Praefatio).

⁴⁸ Cf. the opening sentence: "*Cum in tanta verborum multitudine nonnulla etiam Sanctorum dicta non solum ab invicem diversa, verum etiam invicem adversa videntur*," etc., and this from the concluding sentences: "*Philosophus ille omnium perspicacissimus Aristoteles in praedicamento 'ad aliquid' adhortatur dicens: 'Fortasse autem difficile est de hujusmodi rebus confidenter declarare, nisi pertractatae sint saepe; dubitare autem de singulis non erit inutile.'*"

⁴⁹ One difference between Abaelard and Gobarus consists in the fact that the latter has also included in the scope of his antithetical work the mutually contradictory judgments of the fathers on leading persons and circumstances of church history. Abaelard refrained from this. But on the other hand both were careful not to quote in their citations "apocryphal" sayings (Abaelard, Praefatio, p. 17), and, like Gobarus, Abaelard too let Holy Writ alone; indeed, he expressly emphasized its certainty in contrast to tradition (Praefatio, pp. 10 ff.). The suggestions in Abaelard's preface as to how the contradictions of tradition can be obviated are of no great consequence.

vention of Aristotelianism to the same phenomena. It even happens that a few chapters are alike in content: cf. Abaelard, chapter 23 ("quod 'Spiritus domini ferebatur super aquas' intelligendum sit de Spiritu Sancto, et non") with Gobarus I, 28; Abaelard, chapter 46 (the angels created before the world, et non) with Gobarus I, 23, etc.

"Hoc genus literarum [the patristic tradition] non cum credendi necessitate, sed cum judicandi libertate legendum est" — this liberating utterance of Abaelard (Praefatio, p. 14) expresses, we may be sure, the opinion of Gobarus as well.

APPENDIX

Gobarus's Contributions to the Exegesis of New Testament Passages and to the Church History of the first three Centuries

(a) New Testament.

On I, 2: According to the traditional reckoning based on Luke 1, 26, etc., the Baptist was born on the 24th of June, and was conceived on the 24th of September. This corresponds to December 25 as the date for the birth of Jesus. If the fifth (sixth) of January is taken for the birth of Jesus, and John's birth put six months earlier, the conception of John will be moved forward into October. Thus neither thesis nor antithesis here contemplates December 25 as the date of the birth of Jesus. This is very remarkable. Those who shifted the conception of John to November proceeded from January 6 as the date of the birth of Jesus (conception on the 6th of April) and reckoned back not six, but only five, months, because Luke 1, 26 says that Gabriel was sent to Mary *in* the sixth month. This brought them to the month of November. So far as I know, such a calculation does not appear elsewhere in the tradition.

On I, 3: The two familiar dates for the birth of Jesus stand here, just as they stood opposed to each other in the fourth, and the third, century.

On I, 10: The thousand years belong to the Apocalypse of John, the resurrection of beasts to Isaiah 11; but the revelling

for one thousand years and marriage go back to Papias or his sources of information in Asia Minor. Cerinthus (Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 28) was certainly not cited by Gobarus, since the latter left heretics unnoticed.

On I, 15: Photius has not adduced the antithesis here, for he forthwith criticizes the thesis; but in the antithesis the eternity of the punishments of hell must have been affirmed, with an appeal to the Apocalypse, in which endless punishment is taught.

On I, 43 (Matthew 11, 11): The application of *μικρότερος* to Jesus is found in many fathers; with that to John the Evangelist I am not otherwise acquainted. It is a curiosity, and bears witness to the special esteem for the Evangelist; perhaps it is to be found among the Syrians.

On I, 44 (Jesus' age): It is interesting at so late a date to meet with the view that Jesus lived to be almost fifty; the idea goes back to Irenaeus, whom Gobarus had read (*Adv. haer.* ii. 22 and *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, chapter 74, on the basis of John 8, 57 and the testimony of the Asia Minor presbyters).

On I, 45: This relates to the well-known question on which the Synoptics and John part company; Philoponus accepted the date as given by John.

On I, 46 (John 3, 14): This, like chapters 44, 45, 47, relates to passages from the Gospel of John, which the Monophysites specially esteemed (see above, on I, 43). The interpretation of the brazen serpent received much attention from the fathers, and with precisely the formulation of the problem here given.

On I, 47: So far as I know, the tradition that it was Thomas who struck off Malchus's ear is not found elsewhere. The statement perhaps stood as a gloss in a Synoptic gospel (John alone mentions Peter); and presumably in Greater Syria, for in this patriarchate Thomas played the chief rôle.

On I, 51, 52: Since no antithesis stands in chapter 52, we must assume that Gobarus himself shared the view held by Monophysites, that the sacrifice of the body of Christ took place in the breaking of the bread at the celebration of the Last Supper. — With reference to the last dates in the history of

Jesus Gobarus states not merely two, but three views, the third being that of the church. The other two have this in common, that the resurrection is assigned to the day after the crucifixion; but they differ in two other points: (1) the first follows John, the second the Synoptics; (2) the first puts the ascension one day after the resurrection, the second is silent about it. Both the dating of the resurrection but one day after the crucifixion and the dating of the ascension one day after the resurrection are otherwise unknown, or at most there are only uncertain testimonies for the assignment of the resurrection to the day after the crucifixion; see W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, 1909, pp. 158 ff., 253 ff., 306 ff., and E. Preuschen in the *Protestantische Realencyclopädie*, XIV, pp. 725 ff. I cannot here enter upon an investigation of these remarkable statements of dates, and will merely remark that those who assigned the resurrection to the day after the crucifixion followed a peculiar reckoning of the nights.

On II, 14: In the question of the tradition concerning the Nicolaitans Gobarus has not only apprehended the salient point but also cited almost all the material (noting even the passage hidden away in Pseudo-Ignatius, *Trall.* 11, who, it should be noted, was read with special diligence among the Monophysites, and regarded as a high authority). Of the witnesses for the innocence of the Nicolaitans only Const. Apost. vi. 8 is lacking. It is to be further observed that Gobarus has produced the witnesses in proper chronological order. Whether Hippolytus's *Syntagma* or his *Refutatio* is meant can not be decided. The question whether the deacon Nicolaus himself turned into a wild Gnostic was destined to disquiet the church more and more.

On II, 15 (Epistle to the Hebrews): It is remarkable that Gobarus entirely omits the view that this epistle, in its extant form, was written by Paul. That not only Hippolytus and Irenaeus but also the Latin tradition concerning the epistle receives no mention from him was to be expected. The failure of Hippolytus to accept Hebrews as a Pauline epistle, can be shown from Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 20 and Photius, *Bibliotheca* XLVIII; in both cases the name Hippolytus is wrongly inter-

changed with the name Caius; Gobarus is thus independent of Eusebius. That Irenaeus did not reckon the epistle a part of the New Testament, we know indirectly; Gobarus, however, must have had positive information that Irenaeus recognized only thirteen Pauline epistles, otherwise he could not have expressed himself so definitely. The statement about Eusebius came from *H. E.* iii. 38; and the slip of the pen (confusing the Roman and the Alexandrian Clement) is thereby explained. Gobarus has combined Eusebius's statement with that of the Alexandrian Clement, although they do not entirely agree in their views about the origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

After I, 40, 41, Gobarus gave the interpretation of the doctors of the church and Severus for the difficult passage in Matthew 24, 36; unfortunately Photius has given us neither the interpretations nor the names of these doctors.

(b) Fathers of the First Centuries.

On II, 4: Severus of Antioch still knew the work of Papias, unless he derived from Irenaeus v. 33, 3 f. the statement that according to Papias the kingdom of heaven consists in the enjoyment of certain material foods. This derivation is, however, very probable, since (II, 5) Severus mentioned Irenaeus in the same breath with Papias. From I, 10 it follows (see above) that Gobarus was acquainted with Papias, but here too the acquaintance may have been merely indirect.

On I, 13: From the historical point of view the most interesting statement made by Gobarus is the quotation from Hegesippus. It reads: τὰ ἡτοιμασμένα τοῖς δικαίοις ἀγαθὰ οὐτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδεν οὐτε οὖς ἤκουσεν οὐτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη. Ἡγήσιππος μέντοι, ἀρχαῖός τε ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀποστολικός,⁵⁰ ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ τῶν Ὑπομνημάτων,⁵¹ μάτην μὲν εἰρήσθαι ταῦτα λέγει, καὶ καταψεύδεσθαι τοὺς ταῦτα φαμένους, τῶν τε θείων γραφῶν καὶ τοῦ κυρίου λόγοντος· Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν οἱ βλέποντες καὶ τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν τὰ ἀκούοντα, καὶ ἐξῆς. The statement "in the fifth book" gives to the quotation a special degree of certainty. That Hegesippus

⁵⁰ This characterization of Hegesippus must be due to Gobarus; Photius had no cause to characterize him in this way.

⁵¹ The following words: οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτι καὶ παθὼν, belong to Photius (see above).

attacked Paul ⁵² is extremely unlikely, first because he gives the citation in a form different from that of Paul ⁵³ in 1 Corinthians 2, 9, secondly because he speaks of more than one who use (or misuse) the saying, and finally because in Paul himself it is a quotation, and we know numerous passages in which it is cited as a word of Scripture or of the Lord. ⁵⁴ The real state of things can only be as follows: Hegesippus had in mind in his polemic heretics who misused the saying for their celestial fantasies, and did not remember that it is found in Paul as well. But Gobarus knew the saying only as Pauline, and, finding it rejected in Hegesippus, seized on it in order to show that even an ancient and apostolic man had contradicted an apostle. Could there be a stronger testimony to the uncertainty of tradition? Whether Gobarus had the citation at first or second hand, cannot be certainly determined; but the exactness of the formula of citation favors the former assumption.

On I, 36: That Gobarus made direct or indirect use of Irenaeus, see above on I, 44, II, 4 f., 15; but from I, 36 it follows that he also mentioned a view of Irenaeus as to the abode of the soul after its departure from the body. The reference is to Irenaeus v. 31, 2: αἱ ψυχαὶ ἀπέρχονται εἰς τὸν ἀόρατον τόπον τὸν ὠρισμένον αὐταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, κτλ.

On II, 17: Among the quotations from Hippolytus is found also his judgment on Montanism, at least it is stated that this was different from that of Gregory of Nyssa. Since Gregory, like Basil, did not concede the validity of the Montanists' baptism, Hippolytus must have acknowledged it, which, in the light of Refutatio viii. 19, is very probable.

On I, 9, 12, 14, 31; II, 3-5, 16: So far as we can see, Gobarus never quoted Origen as a witness for a thesis or antithesis. The

⁵² It was formerly held that this confirmed the Jewish Christianity of Hegesippus; but Hegesippus was not a Jewish Christian.

⁵³ Neither τοῖς δικαίοις nor τὰ ἀγαθὰ is found in the verse from Paul.

⁵⁴ Cf. Resch, Agrapha, 1889, pp. 102 ff., 154 ff.; also his Agrapha, 1906, pp. 25 ff.; Zahn, Forschungen, VI (1900), pp. 247 ff. τὰ ἀγαθὰ is also found in this saying in Athanasius, De virginitate 18, and in Origen, Hom. xviii. 15 in Jerem.; in Origen are also the words οἱ δίκαιοι; see also Const. Apost. vii. 32 and Epiphanius, Haer. 64, 69. On the apocryphal sayings compare also Acta Petri Vercell., p. 98 (ed. Lipsius) and my discussion in Texte und Untersuchungen, XLII, Heft 4, pp. 43, 49.

chapters here grouped together relate to teachings of Origen which were supported by orthodox teachers also (especially by Gregory of Nyssa). — I, 12: Since Origen taught that after the fall man was thrust down from paradise (situated in the third heaven), he must also have taught that “the trees of paradise are endowed with reason and with intelligence and logos,” although I do not recall having read this in Origen. (Is it perhaps to be found in Gregory of Nyssa?) — I, 14: The doctrine that punishments purify, and that finally even the wicked, having been purified by their punishments, are redeemed, is as much the teaching of Origen as is the doctrine of the preëxistence of souls, the doctrine of the investment with flesh after the soul’s fall (I, 30), the view that the “skins” are the bodies (I, 9), and the doctrine of apocatastasis, for which Gobarus (II, 3) cites Gregory of Nyssa. It is worthy of note that in I, 31 the souls of Moses, the prophets, Socrates, Plato, John the Baptist, the Apostles, and, above all, that of the Lord are enumerated as eminent souls — a “liberal” grouping which is certainly that of Origen, but which Gobarus must have read also in Gregory of Nyssa or in some other admittedly orthodox admirer of Origen. — The catalogue of Origen’s partisans and opponents in II, 16 gives us no new information (but see the following paragraph); it is based in part on Eusebius’s Church History (see Alexander of Jerusalem, *Eus.*, *H. E.* vi. 14).

On I, 50; II, 6–8, 16: Our knowledge of the literary activity of Dionysius of Alexandria is really enlarged by Gobarus. That Dionysius addressed a letter to his old teacher Origen at the time of the latter’s martyrdom (II, 16) is, indeed, mentioned by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 46); similarly the judgments (II, 6, 7) of Athanasius, Basil (compare the thorough exposition in Feltoe, “The Letters and Other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria,” 1904), and Theodoret (II, 8) on Dionysius are well known; but only from Gobarus (II, 16) do we learn that Dionysius wrote to Theotecnus of Caesarea in praise of Origen, and further, that he taught that the body in which the risen Lord appeared was of the same nature as before (I, 50), and hence not yet transformed into its future glory, nor such as it was at the trans-

figuration. In what work (or letter) Dionysius taught this, cannot be determined. (If I am not mistaken, Feltoe has overlooked this statement.) It is surprising to meet this realistic view in an Alexandrian.

On I, 37: Gobarus cited the infrequently quoted Cohortatio of (Pseudo-) Justin (chapter 23; there from a passage from Plato), perhaps under the name Ἐλεγχος (see my *Altchristliche Literatur-Geschichte*, II, 2, pp. 151 ff.).

FROM JOHN MARK TO JOHN THE THEOLOGIAN; THE FIRST GREAT DEPARTURE FROM PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY

GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT

THE title of this article suggests the difference between our oldest gospel and our latest. The importance of the theme lies in the fact that this difference is not one of development, such, for instance, as the difference between the laws of Elizabeth's England and the common law of the United States, but is rather the difference of deep and pervasive contrariety and even of sharp and sweeping antagonisms. To the task of setting forth this fateful difference, which affects our common loyalty to the Master, and on the full recognition of which by the church depends in no small measure the future of our Christian faith, the following study is devoted.

I

We pass without comment the broad literary disparity between the style of Jesus' sayings according to Mark and according to John, not because we regard this point as without significance for our view of John's Gospel, but because, however it be regarded, it does not seriously affect the conclusion to which more fundamental facts resistlessly constrain us. Nor shall we dwell on the well-known but still baffling lack of agreement between these two writings in regard both to the scene and the duration of the ministry of Jesus. It seems possible, indeed, though not probable, that to some degree these grave divergences might be harmonized if we had full historical details on the points in question, for it is not to be forgotten that our information is here sadly limited.

We advance now to the clear and radical difference between the earlier gospel and the latest in what they say of the man whose great reformatory work immediately preceded the ministry of Jesus. Here our confidence in the historical character

of one or the other of our documents is sharply challenged by an extraordinary fact. According to Mark, while John the Baptist was indeed a herald of the Messiah and urged repentance in preparation for his day, he bore no personal witness whatever to Jesus of Nazareth as Messiah, either at the time of his baptism or later, and the last glimpse we have of him before his head fell under the executioner's axe shows him in grave doubt whether Jesus was 'the coming one' of Israel's long hope. But according to John the whole purpose of the Baptist and the very culmination of his forceful activity was nothing else than a personal witnessing to Jesus as the Messiah. He claimed that his own certainty in this matter rested on an unmistakable divine sign, a vision of God's Spirit descending upon Jesus accompanied by words which explicitly identified him as the Christ. And further, according to the Fourth Gospel, the Baptist was never in doubt regarding the mission of Jesus. Again and again, when Jesus was in sight, he pointed him out to his own disciples as the Saviour,¹ and later, when at a distance from Jesus, he referred to him as the Christ.² His testimony was so confident and inspiring that according to our author many were led by it to believe on Jesus. But more than this unshakable conviction of the messiahship of Jesus, the Baptist, according to the Fourth Gospel, had also a marvellous knowledge of his nature and his work. Thus he hints that Jesus had preëxisted from the beginning, and when he first points his disciples to him he does it in terms which imply that Jesus was to die a violent death, a truth which, according to the oldest gospel, dawned on Jesus himself only gradually, and which was not made known to his intimate friends until after the great day at Caesarea Philippi. Strange indeed that this truth should have been plainly declared by the forerunner! Again, the Baptist, according to John, openly announced the universality of the saviourhood of Jesus, while in the oldest gospel even the Master himself implied rather than uttered this truth, and did not do that until it was becoming plain that his own people would not accept him.

It is plain that these thoughts, which are given as part of the

¹ John 1, 29, 36.

² John 3, 22-30.

historical witness of the Baptist to Jesus, do not present him as he is presented in the oldest gospel — a practical preacher of righteousness, intent on making his hearers ready for the coming kingdom. They acquaint us rather with a speculative mind, intent on making known the transcendent nature of Jesus. Moreover it is obvious to any careful reader of the Fourth Gospel that these thoughts which are attributed to the forerunner of Jesus are fundamental in the belief of the author himself. We cannot, therefore, hesitate to conclude that the writer uttered his own ideas through the lips of the Baptist. He does not belong in the same class with Thucydides, for though this Greek historian composed the speeches of the various characters who appear on his pages, he tells us that he sought to make these speeches suit the respective characters and the situation in which each one was placed. Our author belongs rather with that numerous group of writers in the century before Jesus and in the century after him who sought to give greater weight to their ideas by putting them on the lips of some noted man of the past, as Enoch, Noah, Moses, or Baruch.

A warning arises at this point out of the very ground of the latest gospel. If the author freely attributed his own views to the Baptist, thus utterly transforming the representation of him given in our oldest historical narrative, it is possible that he also ascribed his own views to Jesus. It is therefore the duty of the reader to ask himself to whose voice he is listening as he reads the words that are here put on the Master's lips.

We come now to the weighty introduction to the Fourth Gospel, wherein the author clearly announces his point of view. This introduction is nothing less than the author's confession of faith in regard to the Being of whom he is about to write. It is a comprehensive summing up of his belief regarding the nature and work of that Being in pre-christian ages, followed by his identification with the historical Jesus and his activity in him. This begins with the great assumption that there existed from the beginning, by the side of God, a Being called the Logos. Agent in the creation of the universe, source of life and light to all men, this Logos came in some special manner

to "his own," but was not received. At last he came among men in a visible form, and the writer represents himself as one of those who had beheld his "glory." Then, after contrasting Christ with Moses, the writer makes the finality of Christ's revelation depend on the fact that He alone, being of the same nature with the Father, had seen and declared him.

This is the lofty confession that stands at the portal through which we enter this gospel. Its tone of certainty, its air of mystery, and the majestic sweep of its thought tend to fill the reader's mind with awe, as if one about to cross the threshold of a temple were to meet an angel with a finger on his lips and his whole form refulgent with unearthly light.

We are here largely in the realm of pure speculation, some of which, both in form and content, proceeds, as is well known, from earlier Greek thinking. We see in advance in what light the earthly career of Jesus is about to be presented. The author's aim is not to write history, or "supplement" an existing narrative, or employ accredited facts as an evangelist of the Kingdom, but simply to communicate his own faith, as he explicitly declares toward the end of his writing.³ If the reader disregards this frank indication of the author's aim, he does it at the peril of a misunderstanding than which, if he is a Christian, no misunderstanding whatsoever could be more serious, for this concerns the very soul of the historical gospel.

The aim of John Mark, on the other hand, though nowhere expressed, may be safely inferred from his writing. He sketches in a notably simple and objective manner the public life of Jesus. That he selected from the material at his hand we may readily believe, and that his selection was determined by what he thought to be the needs of evangelism in his day is probable; but there is no reason to doubt that his purpose was to give a true historical sketch. Between this aim and that of our latest gospel the divergence is open and ominous.

With this word of caution we pass to the supremely important subject of the contrast between the oldest gospel's presentation of the works and words of Jesus and their presentation in the latest gospel.

³ John 20, 31.

II

First, the signs, or mighty works, of Jesus. Each of the narratives before us records a wonderful act by him near the beginning of his ministry, and these two are largely typical of all the wonderful acts which each writer reports. Mark's list begins with the cure of a demoniac, John's with the instantaneous transformation of water into wine.

The demoniac, or insane man, interrupted the service in the synagogue at Capernaum, proclaiming Jesus as the "Holy One of God." Jesus, who naturally did not wish to be proclaimed by demoniacs, silenced the man. His motive is intelligible, intelligible also the quick result of his word. This did not transcend the effects known to flow from the impact of one personality upon another.

In John, on the other hand, the first mighty work of Jesus is something utterly different. Jesus with a few followers attends a wedding in Cana. The stock of wine has been exhausted, presumably not until all the guests had "drunk freely." Six stone jars, holding, all together, an amount roughly estimated at 108 to 162 gallons, are filled to the brim with water at the command of Jesus. Then, at his word, the pitchers are filled and carried to the master of the feast, who, after tasting the content, pronounces it better than the wine they had already drunk. By this act, says the narrator, Jesus manifested his "glory," and his disciples believed on him. Here, according to the plain meaning of the story, was something that went beyond the utmost reach of human power. Moreover the act had no other apparent motive than to prolong a wedding banquet at which the guests had already drunk freely.

It is true, the writer of the gospel looked upon the act as manifesting what he calls the "glory" of Jesus, which he here leaves quite undefined, and he says also that the disciples of Jesus, in consequence of the act, "believed on him," another statement which is left for the present undefined. But should we not say that the motive of Jesus himself in the act, or one motive at last, was to lead his disciples to believe on him? Doubtless the author thought so, but we cannot share that view

without doing violence to the explicit teaching of our oldest historical tradition. This plainly forbids our holding that Jesus ever sought to secure faith in himself by working material signs such as his countrymen associated with the appearance of the Messiah. This point will appear again in connection with some related matter; so without further comment on these two deeds we will group with the first the other wonderful acts to be found in Mark, and with the second the other signs in John.

Mark sketches twelve other concrete cases of healing by Jesus — thirteen in all, and has five general references to occasions when at least several sick were healed. He records only three mighty works by Jesus which are not cures — three out of a total of twenty-one. Now in regard to these cures, as described in the oldest gospel, it is to be noted, without presenting here the detailed proof from the text, first, that the only explanatory words or acts of Jesus touching the subject teach that they were wrought by faith on the part of the sick and by prayer on his own part; secondly, that the rôle of a healer, to which his boundless compassion led Jesus at the beginning of his ministry, was early laid aside by him; and thirdly, that the narrative does not claim spiritual results from the cures. The Gerasene demoniac and Bartimaeus are the only exceptions to the rule.

The three wonderful incidents in Mark which are not cures of disease — to wit, stilling a storm, feeding a multitude, and walking on water, we need not discuss. Our conclusions regarding their historical character may be briefly stated. As to the walking on the lake, Mark's narrative suggests that the underlying historical event was in itself not miraculous but such that it lent itself easily to the formation of a legend.⁴ The account of stilling a storm, if taken literally, is inconsistent with Jesus' declared aversion to "signs," and it lacks what the cures of Jesus always possessed, that is, an adequate motive. Both these considerations are equally forcible against the historical character of the story of the loaves and fishes. Further, the historical character of this reputed act of Jesus is open to seri-

⁴ See especially 6, 45; 48 last clause.

ous question on the ground that, had it been historical, the subsequent doubt of the disciples and the demand for "signs" by scribes and Pharisees would be wholly unintelligible.

We call again to mind, in passing to John, that these three incidents in Mark are in striking contrast to the great bulk of the wonderful works there narrated.

What now do we find in the Fourth Gospel? In addition to the wonder at Cana, already considered, we have four mighty works besides the two that are taken from the oldest gospel — feeding a multitude and walking on the water.⁵ Of these seven signs only three are works of healing — three out of seven, while in the oldest gospel, as we have seen, only three out of twenty-one are *not* works of healing. But far more significant than the relatively small proportion of cures in John is his wide departure from the oldest gospel in the manner and conditions of the cures. Thus he has no reference to a need of faith on the part of the sick, which is so prominent in Mark, no reference whatever to Jesus' own faith in God and to his prayer as instrumental in the cures, and finally, no reference to the compassion of Jesus as prompting the cures. Further, in two of the three cures in John Jesus himself takes the initiative, as is especially noticeable in the case at Bethesda, where, in utter contrast to his method in the oldest gospel, he is represented as singling out one sick person from many and healing this man while yet a total stranger to him. Thus it seems to have been the aim of the author to represent Jesus as sovereignly independent in his cures. The sick man's attitude is nothing, the healer is everything.

Of the three wonderful incidents of the oldest gospel which are not works of healing two reappear in John, but they are significantly altered. As regards the feeding of a multitude, in Mark the disciples take the initiative, in John it is Jesus who takes it; in Mark the situation suggests the need of some action, for it is evening and the crowd are in an uninhabited region without food, while in John there is no apparent need of help, yet Jesus, even when he first sees the throng coming to him, asks how they are to be fed. The writer hastens to tell

⁵ The appendix to John is not considered.

us that this question was merely to test Philip, and that Jesus had his plan of action all complete. Thus the event loses entirely the unpremeditated character which it has in the oldest gospel and appears as a preconceived miracle, on which in the sequel Jesus bases a long discourse concerning himself. In John's story of Jesus walking on the lake it is to be noticed, first, that John drops the peculiarly important statement of the oldest gospel, that it seemed to the disciples in the boat as though Jesus were going past them. On the contrary, he represents him as coming directly toward the boat, and thus deprives his readers of the clearest trace we have of the underlying historical fact. And secondly, we note that in John the boat, though several miles from its destination, was then "straightway" at the land after Jesus had entered it. In the oldest gospel the boat continued its journey to the shore without miraculous assistance.

Among the cures in Mark's narrative are two cases of blindness. In the first case Jesus made use of spittle, and a gradual cure was effected. This was done as privately as possible. In the second, that of Bartimaeus, Jesus declared plainly, "Thy faith hath saved thee." In both instances Jesus was besought to help. In John also there is a case of the cure of blindness. Here, according to witnesses summoned for the purpose of testifying, the patient was born blind. There is no indication that he asked to be healed, or indeed had any knowledge of Jesus prior to the moment when his eyes were anointed and he was sent to the pool of Siloam. Finally, it appears⁶ that Jesus took up the case of this blind man, and healed him, simply in order to give an ocular proof of a doctrine regarding himself.

Thus, in passing from John Mark to John "the theologian," we pass from cures morally conditioned and not transcending human power to an unequivocal display of divine power, unsolicited and unconditioned.

Within the sphere of the mighty works of Jesus according to the earliest and the latest gospel one point remains for consideration, and that is the contrast between the story of the

⁶ John 9, 5.

daughter of Jairus and that of Lazarus. Each story stands alone in its respective source.

Jairus of Capernaum, whose child was at the point of death, prayed Jesus to come and lay his hands upon her. Jesus immediately complied, but before he had reached the house of Jairus it was reported that the child was dead. Jesus, however, on his arrival said that she was not dead, and at his touch and summons she arose.

Lazarus of Bethany was sick, and his sisters sent to Jesus, telling him of the fact. But Jesus did not respond as he had done in the case of Jairus. On the contrary he waited two days. In the mean time Lazarus had died and been buried. Moreover, according to the author, Jesus had waited for this very event, and was "glad" that he had not been in Bethany while Lazarus was sick. On the fourth day after the death of Lazarus Jesus arrived in Bethany, went to the tomb of his friend, had the stone removed from the door, and then with a loud voice, in the presence of many witnesses, summoned Lazarus to come forth. And he who had been dead four days came forth, though his feet were bound together with gravebands and his face bound about with a napkin. The lesser prodigy of a human body moving without the use of eyes or feet is lost in the stupendous wonder of the return of the spirit to its earthly tabernacle.

It seems impossible not to feel that in passing from the earlier story to the later we have passed from the world of reality to a world of unreality, from the realm of sober history to that of fiction. The event in John seems to be staged for display, but surely the Jesus of the earliest gospel avoided all display. The event in John, if historical, was the most spectacular and inexplicable act of Jesus, and yet no writer of the first century shows any trace of acquaintance with it, not even those writers who followed the course of Jesus from its beginning to its end, and who had the keenest interest in all his mighty works. How could they fail to record what must certainly have seemed to them the most amazing work of all? We must conclude that they failed to record it for the simple reason that it had not oc-

curred. The story is the author's allegorical way of teaching the truth that Jesus brought life to men.

III

Passing now to the Master's teaching as given in the oldest gospel and the latest, we find the contrast between these writings still more impressive and permanently significant. Let this be considered as briefly as possible.

The theme of the oldest gospel is plainly the Kingdom of God. The nearness of that kingdom was part of the first announcement by Jesus; that the kingdom would be seen in power by some of the disciples was the solemn declaration at Caesarea Philippi; and on the last evening of his life, while at the table with the apostles, he spoke of drinking new wine in the kingdom of God. It was as a preparation for entering God's kingdom that he called on men to repent, as the Baptist had done before him, and it is recorded of the apostles that when sent out in Galilee they too preached repentance, doubtless with the same august event in view which their Master had announced in his preaching. The characteristic stories of Jesus were obviously told in order to teach various truths about the kingdom of God.

Again, the central place that the kingdom had in the daily life and talk of Jesus is illustrated by such incidents as that of the children who were brought to him for his blessing and regarding whom he said, "Of such is the kingdom of God," and that of the rich young man who, staggered at the request of Jesus to sell all and follow him, went away sorrowful, which led Jesus to exclaim, "How difficult it is for those that have riches to enter the kingdom of God!"

Such is the theme of Jesus according to the oldest gospel. About himself he is there represented as saying extremely little, even in the inner circle of his friends, nor do the acts which are there recorded imply more regarding himself than is contained in his words. The freedom with which he set aside Jewish rites, such as fasting, distinction of clean and unclean foods, and observance of the Sabbath, argues the consciousness of a prophet,

as does also the assumption that the men and women who sat around him in Peter's house in Capernaum, listening to his words, were by that very act doing the will of God. Prophetic or Messianic consciousness is manifest also in his word to the disciples that in his teaching the "mystery" of the kingdom of God was given to them.

In the great hour at Caesarea Philippi, at the crisis in the experience of his disciples in their relation to him, Jesus tacitly accepted the confession of Peter, "Thou art the Christ," and at last, in the night of his trial, he answered the high-priest affirmatively, when he asked if he were the Messiah. This was his first public claim to messiahship, or rather not so much a direct claim as an admission of the fact. It is unmistakably stamped on Mark's narrative that Jesus, throughout his entire ministry, practised the utmost reserve in regard to making any open and formal claim to messiahship. The demoniacs who, feeling the irresistible might of his personality, cried out that he was "the Holy One of God," he silenced, and though he accepted the homage of his intimate disciples at Caesarea Philippi, he enjoined upon them that they should not make known abroad what they had come to recognize in him.

If, therefore, anything whatever in the oldest gospel is to be regarded as historical, we must so regard its representation that Jesus said very little about himself in his teaching, and that, excepting the semi-private event at Caesarea Philippi, he avoided till the last scene of his life any formal admission that he regarded himself as the Messiah.

Passing from this survey of the theme of our oldest gospel to a corresponding survey of the latest, we face the most startling dissonance in the entire New Testament. The theme of the teaching of Jesus is no longer the kingdom of God. What is now everywhere in the foreground, in private and in public, is a personal claim of Jesus. There is no reserve on his part with reference to messiahship, such as is so striking a feature of the oldest gospel, and beyond and above the claim to be the Messiah is another transcendent claim of which the oldest gospel has no trace. We will now pass in rapid review the abounding evidence that supports this statement. And first,

on the lack of reserve regarding messianic claims, the following facts may be cited. Nathanael's enthusiastic recognition of messiahship is quietly accepted by Jesus, even before he had appeared as a preacher in Galilee or elsewhere. To the woman at the well, though a Samaritan, Jesus frankly declares his messiahship. To the blind man whose eyes he had opened Jesus said that he was "the Son of God" — words which the author understood as involving all the content of the Hebrew word Messiah, if not more.⁷ To the Jews who asked for a plain statement whether he were the Christ, Jesus replied that he had told them plainly, and moreover that his works bore witness to him, that is, confirmed his messianic claim. He accepted Martha's confession that he was "the Christ, the Son of God," and neither then nor at any other time did he, according to John, enjoin silence on his friends respecting the proclamation of his messiahship. Jesus spoke of himself freely as "the son of man," and according to the author of the Fourth Gospel this title was understood by the common people of Jerusalem as equivalent to Messiah.⁸

It is obvious, when we consider such texts as these, that the studied reserve touching the messianic claim which the oldest gospel ascribes to Jesus has now completely vanished and that its very opposite is urgently asserted. This line of thought, running through the latest gospel, illustrates in part the statement that the theme of this writing — that is, the theme of Jesus according to this writing — unlike that of the oldest historical narrative, is not the kingdom of God but the personal claim of Jesus.

The second line of illustration, far more conspicuous even than the first, is the ever-recurring and widely diversified claim which John attributes to Jesus that he was in nature uniquely one with God. Let this claim be passed in review. In the conversation growing out of the cure at Bethesda Jesus is represented as claiming an authority quite transcending that which the Old Testament anywhere gives to the Messiah. He declares that he, equally with the Father, is an original source of life, and that he, equally with the Father, must be honored.

⁷ John 25, 31.

⁸ John 12, 34.

It is his voice that will summon the dead from their tombs as it summons into life those who are spiritually dead.

In the discourse of which the feeding of a multitude was the text Jesus is represented as saying again and again that he came down out of heaven. This thought, which is plainly foreign to the Hebrew conception of the Messiah, is no less strange to our oldest record of the ministry of Jesus. Yet this claim is here emphasized as the very substance of the gospel. Those disciples who could not accept it went away and walked no more with Jesus, and, by implication, those who did not go away, of whom Peter was the spokesman, accepted it. Again, at the feast of tabernacles, Jesus expressed the ground of his confidence that his witness to men was true in these words: "I know whence I came and whither I go" — words which he later expounded when he said, "I came forth and am come from God," hinting, at the same time, that this 'coming forth' had been from eternity.

A peculiarly impressive illustration of the point under discussion is seen in those statements of the last evening, in which Jesus parallels himself with God. Thus he is represented as promising at one moment that he himself will do whatever his disciples shall ask in his name, and in the next moment that the Father will give whatever they ask in his name. There seems then to be, at this point at least, an absolute blending of the functions of the two. In like manner, Christ declares that he will send the Holy Spirit, and a moment later that the Spirit will be sent by the Father. Then, too, his own love no less than the Father's is said to be the heavenly response to human love, or a part of that response, for the mystical culmination of it is in a joint action — "We will come unto him and make our abode with him," in which words, as regards the divine ministry to believing souls, his identification with the Father is absolute.

We pass to the words of the so-called "high-priestly prayer." The scene of suffering in Gethsemane and the most human cry of Jesus to the heavenly Father, which are found in the oldest gospel, are lacking in the latest one; but here, spoken at nearly the same time, that is, just before Jesus entered Gethsemane,

stands this calm meditation. Though called a prayer, it is far from being a supplication such as the oldest gospel attributes to Jesus in Gethsemane.

In this wondrous outpouring of thought, which reaches the height of the author's philosophic introduction to his gospel and shares its fundamental ideas, Jesus confesses that eternal life is equally dependent on the knowledge of God and the knowledge of himself, and the simple ground of this claim is that he "came forth" from God. In view of this original procession from God he requests that he may now be restored to that "glory" which he had from eternity. This glory is nothing else than that of which the first verse of the Gospel speaks when it says that the Logos was "with God."

The claim running through all these major passages constitutes the theme of Jesus according to John. Its nature explains the omission of some highly important statements of the oldest gospel, such as those that imply human limitations for the knowledge and power of Jesus, and the account of his suffering in Gethsemane. It is this again which determines the character of some new material that is introduced into the latest gospel, as the miracle at Cana, the ministry among the Samaritans, and the raising of Lazarus.

What the author puts forward in his introduction as his own thought he represents Jesus as claiming and teaching through his entire ministry, not in the same terms but in substance.

So we stand here at another parting of the ways. We must choose between the oldest historical narrative, in which the theme of Jesus is not himself but the kingdom of God, and the last gospel, in which his theme is not the kingdom of God but himself.

IV

But the momentous passage from John Mark to John "the theologian" would be imperfectly set forth were we to stop at this point. There are several other conspicuous elements of the Fourth Gospel that claim attention. Each of these asserts, with its own particular degree of emphasis, that when we reach this great landmark in Christian literature we have come a very

long way from the earliest historical narrative of the ministry of Jesus.

(a) The first of these elements to be considered is the doctrine of Believing in Christ. The contrast at this point between the first gospel and the last is most striking. In Mark Jesus is never represented as demanding belief in himself as the condition of acceptance with God and of entrance into his kingdom; but in the Fourth Gospel he is represented as making this demand on a great variety of occasions and in the most explicit terms. It is indeed the most prominent feature of John's narrative, after the claim that Jesus was in nature one with God. The Greek word that signifies 'believe' occurs nine times here to once in Mark, and it is used more times than in all three of the earlier gospels combined with all the writings of Paul. And Jesus himself is represented as using it more than twice as often as the author of the writing. When speaking to individuals, when addressing his disciples as a group and the Jews in general, he demands belief. It is not belief in God that is required, nor belief in himself as revealing the love of God, but belief in himself as "the Son of God," as one who "came forth from God," in short as the eternal Logos. This is the beginning and end of true discipleship.

Again, as regards the normal ground mentioned for the belief which according to the last gospel was demanded by Jesus, we note that, with only slight exceptions, it is his supernatural knowledge and supernatural power. Consider for a moment the evidence for this statement. The disciples at Cana "believed" because of the change of water into wine, and a little later, at the passover, the many in Jerusalem who believed believed because of the "signs" which Jesus did. Some of the Samaritans who "believed" did so because of what the woman said of the supernatural knowledge of Jesus. At the feast of tabernacles opinion regarding Jesus was divided, and while some sought to kill him, others "believed" on him, and said, "When the Christ cometh, will he do more signs than those which this man hath done?" The many who believed on Jesus after the raising of Lazarus "believed," John tells us, because of that which Jesus had done — his work of supernatural power.

It was the same motive that led others, a little later, to believe: they saw Lazarus whom Jesus "had raised from the dead." The rulers who, in the last days, reached at least a timid belief in Jesus appear to have owed it to the many signs they had seen. In a final confession of the disciples we read: "Now know we that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee; by this [by this proof of supernatural knowledge] we believe that thou camest forth from God." All these details of John's narrative are in accord with the words attributed to Jesus regarding the evidential value of his "signs." At the feast of dedication he appealed to the Jews to believe his "works" even if they did not believe him, that is, his simple word. Thus he regarded the "works," that is, the evidences of supernatural knowledge and power, as supremely convincing. Such is the representation of the latest gospel. In the oldest, on the other hand, Jesus, as we have seen, did not demand faith in himself as a condition of entrance into God's kingdom, nor did he claim supernatural knowledge and power.

Another point of wide divergence between the oldest historical tradition and John in regard to believing in Christ is the extent to which the men who saw and heard him believed. According to Mark the common result of the cures and other mighty works of Jesus was amazement of varying degrees. In some cases the cures of Jesus aroused hostility against him, or simply gave offense. Herod Antipas regarded them as evidence that the Baptist, whom he had beheaded, was risen and working in Jesus; others saw in them proof that Elias or one of the prophets had appeared. In two cases only does the narrative indicate that a cure by Jesus was followed by any inner attachment to him on the part of the former patient, and we are left in complete ignorance as to the content of the faith which this attitude involved. There is of course no suggestion whatever that even in these exceptional cases the power of Jesus led to belief that he had "come forth from God."

But when we open the latest gospel all this is changed. The uniform, unmistakable, and quite general result of the supernatural power and supernatural knowledge of Jesus is that men "believed on his name." And not merely individuals here and

there, like the nobleman at Capernaum and the blind man in Jerusalem, but on no less than nine different occasions we are told that "many" believed. There were many at the first passover, probably from different parts of the land, who believed; many of the Samaritans, influenced by the woman's word, and many more when they themselves had heard Jesus; many of the "multitude" in Jerusalem who had seen his signs, and many who had heard what he said about his transcendent authority; many beyond Jordan, where John at first baptized; many in Bethany who saw Lazarus come forth from the tomb; many of the common people who saw Lazarus after he had been brought back to life; and, finally, many of the rulers of Jerusalem.

Here are two departures from the oldest historical tradition of the ministry of Jesus, the second more remarkable than the first. Not only are there many on every hand who are led to believe on Jesus by the evidence of his supernatural knowledge and power, while in the oldest gospel his mighty works usually caused amazement, and only in the case of two individuals are said to have led to a personal attachment; but also the many who believe believe something about Jesus of which the oldest gospel reveals no trace.

These astonishing divergences seem explicable only when we regard them as instances of the metamorphosis of sacred theory into sacred history. As it seemed to the author that Jesus, being the Logos in flesh, must have been able to make himself invisible to his enemies at critical junctures,⁹ and as it seemed fitting that the officers should fall prostrate before such a Being,¹⁰ so he regarded it as fitting that he should depict Christ's influence on his contemporaries as of an irresistible potency.

(b) Another point in the teaching of the last gospel which departs in a radical manner from the oldest historical narrative is its doctrine of Eternal Life. This is but the unfolding of the author's introductory statement that "in him [the Logos] was life." Since he was "from the beginning," and of the same nature with God, the duration of this life-principle is of course

⁹ John 8, 59; 12, 36.

¹⁰ John 18, 6.

thought of as unlimited. But it is the same in the Logos and in the disciples. Emphasis is laid on the everlasting duration of the new life. The believer shall "live forever"; he shall "never die," "never perish," "never see death." Inasmuch as the life of the Logos is his life — appropriated by "eating" Christ — the Master could say to all the disciples, "Because I live, ye shall live also." In the light of these passages the word "eternal," with which the author frequently qualifies the new life, is undoubtedly to be understood in the sense of endless.

Again, the last gospel not only lays great stress on the duration of the believer's life, it also regards it as solely a gift of Christ. The author never says with Paul that eternal life is the gift of God. He occasionally says that a knowledge of God and faith in him condition eternal life, but never that they do this by themselves alone. With the knowledge of God there must be knowledge of Christ, and with faith in God there must be faith in Christ. The Father "gives" men to Christ, or "draws" them to him; but it is always Christ who gives life. How dear to the author was this point of doctrine appears also in the variety of ways in which he represents the appropriation of life. By drinking the draught of water which Christ gives, or by drinking his blood; by eating his flesh, or eating him; by hearing his word, and by keeping his word; by believing on him, or by believing that he came forth from God; by coming to him as the one of whom the Scriptures testify, and by following him; by knowing him and knowing the Father — by all these manifold ways men become sharers of the life which has no end. And, according to the last gospel, they become sharers of it now, in this present age.

Turn for a moment to our oldest gospel. In place of John's fullness of teaching on eternal life we have here but one explicit reference to it.¹¹ Yet on this subject less than on most others would men have been likely to forget an utterance of the Master. How has the rivulet become a broad river! Again, in the oldest gospel, eternal life belongs, not to the present age, but to the age to come, and is regarded as the fruit of a faithful discipleship on earth. Finally, according to our oldest record,

¹¹ Mark 10, 30.

Jesus did not claim to be the source of eternal life. Not only so but his teaching there seems clearly to imply that he thought of it as the gift of God. He who spoke of the coming kingdom as God's and not his own, and who declared that it was not for him to say who should have the highest places in that kingdom; he who, while representing the kingdom of God as the summum bonum, taught men to ask of the Father all that they needed, and so to ask for his kingdom, must have thought of God as the source of eternal life.

It seems most likely that John's departure from the oldest gospel in these points came about under the dominating influence of a certain theory of what Christ was, and in an age which put a very different estimate on historical facts from that which we put on them.

(c) A third element in the teaching of the last gospel which demands careful consideration in the present discussion is its doctrine of the Holy Spirit. All this teaching, with slight exceptions, belongs, according to John, in the last evening of Christ's life. Of these exceptional passages there is only one that shows an important departure from the oldest gospel. This is in the dialogue with Nicodemus, where Jesus says that participation in the kingdom of God is conditioned on baptism not only with water but also with the Spirit. This passage appears to associate the gift of the Spirit with the rite of baptism by water, and hence gives to that rite very great significance. Herein it departs from the oldest gospel, which knows nothing of the necessity of any external rite as a condition of entering God's kingdom. This passage, therefore, like the unauthentic ending of Mark¹² and the late material in Matthew,¹³ points to a time long subsequent to the ministry of Jesus.

The few references that Jesus made to the Spirit according to the oldest gospel, are such as any devout Jew from the days of the great prophets down to his time might have made. They do not discriminate between the Spirit of God and God, and it need therefore hardly be added that they have no suggestion either of an identification of the Spirit with Jesus or of the subordination of the Spirit to him.

¹² Mark 16, 9-20.

¹³ Matt. 28, 16-20.

The transition from this very simple and plain representation of the oldest gospel to what the latest has to say on the same subject is most notable. For we have now, all at once, the elements of a new and somewhat elaborate doctrine of the Spirit. He is described as the Spirit of truth, as holy, and as the paraclete. He proceeds from the Father. His coming is variously conditioned, now upon the prayer of Jesus and again upon his departure from the disciples. In like manner, the inception of the Spirit's ministry lies at one time in an act of the Father, and again in an act of Jesus. His work among those who are not disciples is to convict of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. In the lives of the disciples, on the other hand, he is to take the place of Jesus. He is to teach them all things. He will not only remind them of the words spoken by Jesus while with them, and bear witness of him, but he will also declare to them the things to come. His functions are thus seen to be many and varied.

We are surprised not only by the sudden appearance of this elaborate teaching about the Spirit, but also by the fact that it is all crowded into the last evening of the life of Jesus. It seems indeed most unlikely that Jesus, who, since the day at Caesarea Philippi, had clearly foreseen the tragic end of his ministry, would have left till the last evening the discussion of a subject of such vast importance to his disciples as this doctrine of the Spirit contained in John, but even this extreme unlikelihood is not the most significant point to be considered. Even if we should regard it as possible that the Master could thus have deferred his disclosure of so important a realm of truth, it is quite impossible for an historical student ever to admit that such a disclosure could have been made and yet have left no trace whatever on our oldest narrative. That narrative broadens and deepens as it comes to the close of the life of Jesus. We can follow the course of events from day to day and almost from hour to hour. It is plain that the writer had a full and even minute knowledge of his subject. He follows Jesus through the last evening from Bethany to the large upper room in Jerusalem, and from that room to Gethsemane, giving a graphic account of his movements and a chronicle of his sayings. But

there is not a word about the Holy Spirit! no least suggestion that Jesus had touched this subject! Nor does either of the later gospels of Matthew and Luke add in this particular to what they had received from the oldest narrative. How can we explain this silence if John's account is historical? Had no apostle reported these remarkable sayings of their Master? Had all, or all but one, forgotten them? That can not have been the case, for in these very words concerning the Spirit Jesus is reported by John to have said that the Spirit would bring to their remembrance all that he had said to them. Thus, according to John, they could not have remained ignorant of what Jesus said about the Spirit on the last evening of his life. But it is certainly incredible that the apostles could have reported their Master's words on the Holy Spirit and yet that there should be no trace of them in the oldest gospel, and we may add no trace in Matthew, Luke, or the Logia. We are therefore absolutely shut up to the conclusion that in the doctrine of the Spirit ascribed to Jesus in the last gospel we are not dealing with historical material.

(d) Conspicuous in the teaching of the Fourth Gospel, and in conspicuous disagreement with our oldest record, is the universal scope of the mission of Jesus. In the bearing of the oldest gospel on this subject two points are quite plain. First, Jesus considered that his personal work was for his own people — "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." When he crossed the northern border of his native land, he did not wish to be recognized, and his conversation with the Syro-Phoenician woman was altogether exceptional. But, secondly, when we look into his teaching, we find not seldom a world-wide outlook. The kingdom is likened to leaven which leavens the entire mass in which it is placed. In the parable of the wicked vinedressers, who represent the Jewish people, the vineyard is taken away from those to whom it was first given, and is entrusted to "others." The deed of the woman who anointed the head of Jesus in Bethany is to go forth with the gospel into "the whole world." Then, apart from such isolated passages, the world-wide scope of the work of Jesus is implied in a fundamental manner in his revelation of the fatherhood of God, which

knows no national limitation, and likewise in his claim to be the Messiah.

Such is the simple teaching of the oldest gospel regarding the scope of the mission of Jesus. But when we pass to the last gospel the tone of universality strikes us at almost every step. Thus Jesus works among the Samaritans with great success, and without a suggestion that this work was not in perfect harmony with his mission. In like manner when the Greeks came to him, he did not say that his mission was limited to his own people, but on the contrary he saw in that coming a sign of the glorious fulfilment of his divine calling.

In keeping with these incidents are various words of Jesus in John. In his conversation with the woman of Samaria he recognized that the hour had come when all national barriers were done away in him. He said in the hearing of a multitude in Jerusalem that, if lifted up, he would draw all men to himself; and on the last evening he prayed for all who should yet believe, and foresaw a time when, moved by the spiritual unity of believers, "the world" should believe in his divine mission.

Now in regard to this universalism in the last gospel two things must be said. First, this open declaration by Jesus cannot be harmonized with his acts and words as given in the oldest gospel; and secondly, this ascription to Jesus of an open declaration of the universal scope of his mission is most easily explained as having arisen after the gospel had been widely preached and had won notable successes throughout the Roman Empire. As the author unhesitatingly ascribed to Jesus that teaching on the Holy Spirit which had come through the experience of the Christian community, so in like manner he did not hesitate to ascribe to him an open declaration of the universality of his mission.

Such are the conspicuous lines of teaching in the Fourth Gospel which stand out in bold contrast against the oldest historical narrative.

V

It remains to say a word in conclusion. It has been shown that between John Mark and John "the theologian" there lies a profound gulf, which is most significant in the sphere of the teaching of Jesus.

The Jesus of the oldest gospel is a Jewish carpenter, teacher, prophet, fulfiller of the longings of Israel at their highest and best, one who preached and illustrated the kingdom of God and breathed into the soul of humanity a new, higher, diviner trust in the heavenly Father and an inexhaustible zeal for his kingdom: the Jesus of the last gospel is a cosmic figure, an eternal emanation from God, a man indeed, yet one in whom all human attributes were at times wholly submerged and lost in the effulgence of the "glory" of the indwelling Logos, one who taught chiefly about himself, and who based salvation on faith in his divine nature.

On which side of this gulf between John Mark and John "the theologian" we are to find the truth regarding the historical Jesus is assuredly not an open question. On which side of it the church has found material for its dominant christology is plain to any student.

The last gospel needs no false crown. It has been a spring of comfort to millions of believers. Much that it puts on the lips of Jesus is true even though Jesus never said it. But alas! much that it ascribes to him causes the Jesus of the oldest historical narrative to pass into a most profound eclipse. In so far it may have been as fatal to the religion of Jesus as it has been fruitful for the theology of the church.

Had the last gospel found its place in the New Testament by the side of that other anonymous and richly imaginative writing, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and had it borne as a title something like this, 'Christ for the Greek Philosopher,' it might be easier for the church of the present to discern what essential Christianity is, and hence easier to manifest in its turn that kind of practical transforming spiritual power which once flowed in full current through Jesus of Nazareth.

THE DEFINITION OF GOD

M. BOWYER STEWART

NASHOTAH HOUSE, WISCONSIN

“THE fashion nowadays is to speak of the God in the heart and the God in the Universe.’ ‘Is it the same God?’ ‘Leave it at that,’ said Peter. ‘We don’t know. All the waste and muddle in religion is due to people arguing and asserting that they are the same, that they are different but related, or that they are different but opposed. And so on and so on.’ . . . But the name of God was to Oswald a name battered out of all value and meaning.” So Mr. H. G. Wells, in “Joan and Peter,” muses over the present floating theology, where everybody talks about God, and nobody knows what anybody else is talking about. Mr. Wells himself has done his share of the battering, too. If scrupulous scholars of today have difficulty in determining the meaning of ‘Messiah’ and ‘Lord’ in the beginnings of Christianity, what will the twenty-fifth-century scholars think of the term ‘God’ as used in the twentieth? It is curious, though, that along with this confusion of meaning — in fact the thing which itself adds most to the confusion — is an assumption that ‘God’ is “a distinct and familiar kind of entity, like a dragon or centaur; its existence alone being problematical” (Perry, “Approach to Philosophy,” pp. 108 f.). As a matter of fact, what is now problematical, every time we read the word ‘God,’ is what that word means to the man who has written it. Of course it is a large concept, vague around the edges, and variable with varying moods; but what is central and constant in it? Supposing one says that God suffers, or that God cannot suffer, one needs to have some fairly clear idea *what it primarily is* that suffers or cannot suffer. We can argue indefinitely and disagree eternally about what qualities God has, unless at least we can agree on a primary definition of the subject — what we mean by God in the first place. Several such primary definitions are now current: it is our purpose

here to suggest that Christian theology at any rate, and probably most of our theism, tends to a use of one of these, and that it would be well to use it more clearly, consciously, and consistently in the future.

If to the more naïve thinking of all times God, or the gods, signify the Something Else than the obvious and familiar environment, a Something which is practically important because mysteriously effective in our life, growing theology has slowly come to see in that Something Else a universal power over all things, both the familiar and the unfamiliar; and growing religion has slowly come to attribute to it all the good qualities that it can think of. Thus Israel's prophets insist that God is God of all, absolutely fundamental, and that God is righteous, absolutely good.

By the time we reach a formulated Christian doctrine of God, we have rather long lists of the divine attributes, some resoundingly metaphysical (one may recall how William James speaks of Newman's sonorous chant of the attributes), some literally scriptural; in form, as it stands, a strange-sounding miscellany of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin concepts. Newman says they are all the unfolding of one idea. Manuals of theology say they are ascertained in three ways: by analysis of the idea of infinity and absolute perfection, by inference from divine operations in nature, and by study of supernatural revelation. The last two may be taken together, as both are concerned with operations of God as they come within our experience, whether those operations are natural or supernatural. So there are really two ways of ascertaining the attributes, (1) by analysis of an idea, and (2) by synthesis of experience.

If, then, one can find out something of the character of God by analysis of the idea of infinity and perfection, one is of course using the term 'God' as meaning the infinite and perfect Being. Self-existence, self-sufficiency, immensity, eternity, etc., are aspects of infinite, ultimate Reality; but holiness, righteousness, love, etc., are aspects of infinite, perfect Goodness. Surely these ideas, ultimate reality and ultimate ideality, are two ideas, not one; it is hard to see that the one necessarily involves the other; religion and theology equate them, but

in popular belief very often the most real entity is not particularly good, and the most perfectly good is "just an ideal," not real. There are really two definitions of God here.

The second way of ascertaining the divine attributes, by inference from the works of God, natural and supernatural, likewise involves the definition of God as ultimate Reality. What is most solidly real in this universe? If you can answer that question, you can say what God is. And you can get some truth about God if you get some truth about the real things, even though they be considered less than ultimately real, creatures not Creator, "works," effects, not Cause; for the nature of the cause is seen in its effects. But theology will not take the matter so simply as that; it does not attribute to God all the qualities we find in nature: it selects. Nature is (at least in spots) cruel and stupid, and God means the Reality underlying nature; but in attributing to him the qualities of his works, Christian theists leave out the cruelty and stupidity. It is the other definition of God — God meaning perfect Goodness — that excludes cruelty and stupidity from the list of his attributes. Those things in nature that are best and most beautiful reveal the divine nature: the bad and ugly things reveal something else. So theology works out the attributes of God from our experience, natural and supernatural, on the basis that God is the Reality behind it all, and yet that God is the ideally good Being, revealed by nature only so far as nature is good. Our real experience shows the concrete qualities of God, furnishes the colors and shapes of the picture, gives the detail of it. No analysis of pure Being, absolute Reality, would ever by itself yield any idea of divine omniscience, for instance; our own present experience, taken as real, tells us what knowing is like, and theology infers that God likewise knows, but perfectly, infinitely well. So with other attributes: they are a combination of supreme reality and supreme value. Pure analysis of infinity gives a list of metaphysical attributes that is soon exhausted, if it does not come at last to a sort of infinite zero. But if nature (including of course human nature) is real, and God means the Reality behind nature, or the Reality of nature, then the richness of the divine life, its fullness of concrete ex-

perience, its colorfulness and manifoldness, are in some measure revealed. Likewise if the supernatural comes into our experience, it reveals even more concretely and vividly the detail, if we may so say, of divinity. So the attributes, all but the most abstract of them, are ascertained from what we experience in nature, including especially human nature. But the degree in which God possesses them, and the kind of qualities selected from the total of nature, depend upon the belief that God is not simply Reality but ideally perfect Goodness. And reality and goodness are not the same concept.

But Christian belief in God equates reality and goodness. It comes to this proposition: the supreme reality of the universe is perfectly good. Reality and goodness are, I think, the elemental terms of any statement about God; if one of them is the subject, the other is the predicate (except when the proposition is merely an elucidation of the meaning of one term alone). "God is love" means to a Christian that the fundamental Reality of the universe is the best thing we know about, that is, love. "God is almighty" means that the perfectly good is the actual Reality behind all that is done or can be done. God is a combination of truth and value. All that has ever been hazarded as a description of God — all attributes that have ever been thought out, guessed at, or revealed — all, I think, are variations upon these themes, namely, calling the Real good, or calling the Good real. Dr. A. E. Taylor, writing on 'Theism' in Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, says:

It is only if the Good is also the supreme principle of all existence that it becomes possible to understand how what is and what ought to be can form one "world," and from the recognition of the Good as the Supreme Being theism follows directly.

In this, the Good is subject and Real is the predicate; but he defines theism as

the doctrine that the ultimate ground of things is a single supreme reality which is the source of everything other than itself and has the character of being (a) intrinsically complete or perfect, and (b) as a consequence, an adequate object of unqualified adoration or worship.

Here the Real is the subject and good is the predicate.

A critic has objected to Professor Perry's calling God "neither an entity nor an ideal, but always a relation of entity to ideal." It does sound frightful at first, but it wears rather well. A Christian would say, perhaps, that that relation is a sort of hypostatic or sacramental union: God is not simply 'whatever is,' and not simply a vision of what a perfect Being ought to be; not a Nestorian dualism of fact and value divided, nor a monophysite blurring of the two; but a union of fact and value without loss of the properties of either.

Now the kind of judgment that involves a verdict of value is of course not capable of physical or mathematical demonstration; hence the difficulties of apologetics. I do not see how there can be any belief in God the Real and the Good except through a favorable verdict upon the value of the universe as it is. To say that one believes in God is to say that this universe is "at heart" good. We can believe that the ultimate Reality is good because we can believe that the actual universe in which we live (ourselves included) approximates goodness. This is the heart of the old teleological argument in its various phases; but we cannot demonstrate it, and some do not believe it. On the other hand, exchanging subject and predicate, we can believe that ideal goodness is the most abidingly real thing there is — lasts longer, accomplishes more, explains the universe better, than anything else. And this is the heart of the ontological argument — the idea of the most perfect being conceivable must be the idea of an existing being. The moral argument, from moral ideals to the reality of the good God, goes in the same direction. But it is not demonstrative, and some do not believe it. The arguments cannot be demonstrative, simply because somewhere in them there is always a judging of fact according to value.

Theological books might be much better if in their doctrine of God they would make clear the basic meaning of the term God as they use it, and the derivation of the various attributes. They might say, 'The following are simply involved in the idea of ultimate Reality. The following are simply workings-out of the idea of perfection. The following are idealizations of the reality of our own experience, combinations of the real

and the ideal.' I believe there would be more point to such a classification than there is to the traditional arrangement — quiescent, active, moral, and so on. For it would keep more clearly in mind what the idea of God logically starts with, and would develop the whole doctrine naturally from those two poles of it — Reality and Value.

But of far greater consequence than any possible rearrangement of theological treatises is the possible rearrangement of ordinary people's minds. Children are given an idea of God that is probably great enough for them as children. God is a large, vague, venerable, invisible old man, who rules a universe not much larger than the town. Children grow up, and their knowledge of the physical universe — their universe-concept — grows by leaps and bounds; their knowledge of God, or their God-concept, hardly grows at all in comparison. In a little while their idea of the universe has become so high and mighty that it is not on speaking terms with their idea of God, and they believe in the "existence" of a God whose chief attributes are goodness and invisibility. We do not know — we dread to know — just how many people remain at this stage unto their lives' end, believing in a universe of infinite majesty and power, and in a God who is good like an old man, and invisible like an old man who has died.

That state of mind is of course the soil upon which grows doubt of the existence of God. The idea of God is there, distinct enough perhaps, with recognized qualities of value, like the idea of Santa Claus. The ideal of God may be sublime, according as one has apprehended revelation, or thought out what a perfect being should mean: the whole question is as to the existence of such a being. Is not this situation the almost universal one in, say, nineteenth-century apologetic? And then there are the people who talk loosely about "making God real," by sheer pressure of our moral striving; that seems to me quite typical of our present ways, and it seems to mean about the same as 'making God.' Now all this signifies that of the two focal points in the definition of God, ultimate reality and ultimate goodness, the latter has been kept and the former dropped, or if not dropped, made at least dubious. It is well known, of

course, that some very persuasive thinkers, believing in a God who is the object of religion, personal and good, and real too, in a measure, refuse to believe in him as ultimate Reality. One readily thinks of Bradley, William James, H. G. Wells, and others; it might be interesting to trace the history of the Super-god idea, from the ancient Necessity overruling even the gods, down to the Absolute or the Universe or the Veiled Being of modern thought. Some present-day Christian writers are evidently much taken with this view of God as the object of religion, who is not the ground of all being. I cannot agree that this is the line along which Christian theism is likely to prove itself; but the point at present is not to combat it, so much as to plead for clearness in the use of the term 'God,' which to Christian theists generally does mean the Supreme Being. (C. C. J. Webb's "God and Personality" is a laudable example of such clearness; and Dean Inge, in "Outspoken Essays, Second Series," makes the point unmistakable.)

The restoration of religion is not to be won by continuing the argument for the existence of a God whose character is assumed, but in starting with the existence itself as the first item in the definition of God. When we say 'God,' let us understand by the term, first, the ultimate Reality of the universe, whatever that may be like; and when we pray to God, let us pray to Reality first. Many persons have, I know, found a great deepening of their religious life in such a shift of emphasis or change of order. It seems congenial to minds that have some right idea of natural science. It is akin to that "nature mysticism" which Bishop Merceer has summarized. I do not deny that there are some dangerous kinships also. But in the present state of affairs the most needed thing is to restore to our ordinary religion that forgotten article of our creed, or rather that fundamental definition from which it all starts — not that a God exists, but that primal Reality is what we mean by God, first of all.

THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS AND THE KORIDETHI CODEX

KIRSOPP LAKE AND ROBERT P. BLAKE *

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

SINCE the time of Griesbach it has been generally recognized that the main problem of textual criticism in the New Testament is due to the existence of three distinct types of text, the Neutral, Western, and Syrian (or Antiochian). The great contributions of Westcott and Hort were the clear delineation of this problem and the establishment in considerable detail of the Neutral text. The Western text they only indicated in outline, and the Antiochian text was left with little further definition than that already provided by the *Textus Receptus*.

The period after Westcott and Hort was chiefly devoted to the further study of the Western text¹ and to the identification of a number of intermediate groups which, though they may have been based on the Neutral and Western texts, represent types intermediate between them and the later texts.²

At this stage von Soden took up the question and attacked in the main the problem of these intermediate texts. He did this partly by the discrimination of groups in his Introduction (and this part of his work is extremely valuable, and on the whole as intelligible as highly technical dissertations of this kind can be); partly in a critical edition, which unfortunately was almost a complete failure because it did not provide clear and accurate information.³ It is very hard, indeed impossible,

* The paragraphs below, pages 277-283, in which the origin of the Koridethi MS. is discussed, are written by Dr. Blake.

¹ Especially by Rendel Harris, F. C. Burkitt, Corssen, Blass, and Zahn.

² This began with the publication of the palaeographically Calabrian group of minuscules, 13, 64, 124, 346, by Ferrar (hence called the Ferrar group) and Abbott, 1877, and the investigation of the group by Martin in France, 1885, and Rendel Harris in England, 1893. It was carried further by W. Bousset, "*Textkritische Studien*," 1894, and by K. Lake, "*Codex 1 of the Gospels and its Allies*," 1902.

³ See P. W. Schmiedel, 'Der Ertrag der Arbeit Hermann v. Soden's am Text des Neuen Testaments' in *Theologische Blätter*, 1922, No. 10.

to use it satisfactorily, but it is a great error to think that its author left the problem of the text unchanged.

Von Soden's most certain contribution to our knowledge of the text was concerned with the *K*-text,⁴ but more important than this, especially for the purpose of the present article, was his treatment of the intermediate types connected with the Western text. He thought that what Westcott and Hort called the Western text was a recension made in Jerusalem, and he therefore called it I. The authorities for this text were D latt syr^{sin} syr^{cur} and some groups of minuscules. D latt syr^{sin} syr^{cur} he held to have been contaminated from Tatian, and the groups of minuscules from the *K*-text.

The general consensus of scholars has been against the first half of this part of the theory. Von Soden was certainly wrong in the extent to which he explained the variants of D latt syr^{sin} syr^{cur} by the influence of Tatian, and one unfortunate result of the recognition that he was wrong has been to ob-

⁴ Formerly, though we talked about this text, we knew very little about it. In practice the Antiochian text meant the editions of Stephanus and Elzevir. It was known that in many cases these editions did not really represent the Greek mediaeval text, but there was no clearness on the subject; nor could any clearness ever have been attained without a methodical investigation of almost all existing MSS. This investigation von Soden made. The result is that we now know that the *K*-text is found in at least three forms, *K*¹, *K*², *K*³, and it would not be difficult to take a few MSS., typical of these three forms, and from them produce a usable edition of the *K*-text. Complete accuracy would be unattainable without immense labor, but an edition that would be of enormous help to collators and investigators of the text could be made with relative ease. This addition to our knowledge serves to define the problem as to the *K*-text, with which von Soden left us. What is the date of the *K*-text? I believe that there is no proof of a pure *K*-text before the sixth century. But there are fifth century MSS., such as A (which in the gospels is mainly of the *K*-type), which contain *K*-readings. Are *K*-readings the proof that a *K*-text existed from which they were taken or are they the material from which the *K*-text was made? That is the real problem, although unfortunately von Soden did not see it and assumed that *K*-readings imply a *K*-text, equal, as he thought, in age to the H-text and the I-text. How is it possible to solve this riddle? Not from general probabilities; but by investigating the text of the early Greek fathers, which may hold the key. At present we have no good edition of the texts of Athanasius, the Cappadocians, Chrysostom, or Cyril. Von Soden assumed that we know much more about these texts than we do. Possibly it may not be worth while to do so much in order to learn so little, but patristic evidence is the key to the problem of the *K*-text, and a key which can be gained by simple methods involving long, but not difficult, work. A small percentage of the energy wasted on doctors' dissertations which begin nowhere and return to their starting-point would soon accomplish real results in this field.

secure the important contribution to knowledge made by his treatment of the groups of minuscules. Moreover it is very unfortunate that he misapprehended the position of the so-called Koridethi MS. (von Soden ε 050; Gregory Θ, formerly 1360), which, though palaeographically an uncial, belongs textually to this class.⁵

In his first volume he announced the discovery of this MS., calling it a twin sister of cod. 700, and declaring that it completely solved the riddle of Codex Bezae. Neither statement is quite correct; it is a first cousin (hardly a twin sister) of cod. 700, and it helps to define, rather than to solve, the problem of D. This was tacitly recognized in von Soden's later volumes, where the Koridethi MS. is more correctly classed as a codex of the I^a-group. This group consists mainly of D 28 565 700 and Θ.

This classification is, I think, wrong in two points. (1) D should not be included in the group. D has a text which in the main agrees with the Old Latin, but it has been influenced by, and sometimes conflated with, the Neutral text.⁶ Leaving out of consideration the intrusive Antiochian element in the individual members of the group, the 'family-text' of Θ 28 565 700 is not much closer to D than it is to B. (2) Fam¹ (von Soden's I⁷) and the Ferrar manuscripts (von Soden's I¹) ought to be included in the group.⁷

Certainly these MSS. are all closely related, and — omitting D — von Soden's I^a-text seems identical with the "local text" which I postulated in the introduction to "Codex 1 and its Allies." I there argued that Fam¹, the Ferrar group, 28, 565, and 700 constitute a number of hybrids between an early local text and K.⁸ The Koridethi MS. proves to be another

⁵ This codex is described by Gregory, with bibliographical references, in *Textkritik*, I, 1900, p. 257, his information having been derived from Oskar von Gebhardt.

⁶ Or is it with an early K-text? I think not, but the character of the non-western element in D has never been fully studied. That D is conflate cannot be doubted by any one who has analyzed it.

⁷ I omit some MSS. which on von Soden's showing ought to be included, because their text is not published and I cannot reconstruct it from his apparatus.

⁸ I also included cod. 22, but its affinity is much less clear, at least in Mark i, and I have therefore neglected it in this article. Von Soden reckons it among the 1⁷ MSS.; this may be right in Matthew, but the question requires further investigation.

READINGS OF THE FAMILY			THIRD READING			
	Θ	FAM ¹	FAM ¹²	565	700	5
N	f	ς	ς	f	ς	+υιου του θεου
NB	f	f	ς	f	f	ως
D	f	f	ς	ς	f	τῷ ἡσυχῇ
BD	f	ς	ς	f	ς	εἰς ἀποστολῶν
NBD	f	ς	ς	ς	f	+εμπροσθεν σου
D	f	ς	ς	f	f	βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρημῇ
	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ο βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρημῇ NB
	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	η ἰουδαία
	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	εβαπτίζοντο πάντες
D	f	ς	ς	ς	f	ιορδανῇ ποταμῷ
(NB)	f	ς	ς	ς	f	ιωαννῆς
D	ς	ς	ς	f	ς	οὐκ ὅτι
	f	ς	ς	f	ς	κῆρας λυσαί
NB	f	ς	ς	f	ς	εἰς μὲν
(D)	ς	ς	ς	f	ς	εβαπτίσαι ὑμᾶς
(D)	f	ς	f	f	ς	βαπτίσαι ὑμᾶς
	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	καὶ ἐγένετο
D	f	ς	f	f	ς	ἡσυχῇ
	f	f	f	ς	ς	ναζαρετ
NBD	f	ς	f	ς	f	υἱο ἰωαννου εἰς τὸν ἰορδανην
NBD	f	ς	f	f	ς	ἀπο
NBD	f	ς	ς	ς	f	ῶσαι
BD	ς	ς	f	ς	ς	ἐπ' αὐτὸν
	ς	ς	f	f	ς	οὐκ ἰδοὺ
NBD	f	ς	f	f	ς	ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν
D	f	f	f	f	f	ἐν ᾧ
KII sy ¹²	(3rd)	f	(3rd?)	f	f	εὐδὸς
	f	f	f	f	f	ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ ἐρημῇ
LM 83 boh	ς	f	f	f	f	οὐκ ἐπὶ
	f	ς	f	ς	ς	οὐκ ἐπεσσερακοντα νυκτας
	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	σταυρα

ἐν τῇ ἐρημῇ¹⁰ NB

ΑΠ	14 ιησους	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ο ιησους ¹¹	NBD
NBL	του θεου	f	f	ς	f	f	ς	ς	της βασιλειας του θεου	D
	15 λεγων ¹²	ς	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	λεγων οτι	NBD
NBDL	16 παραγων	ς	ς	f	ς	ς	ς	f	περιπατων	ΑΓΠ
(NB)	του σιμωνος	ς	ς	f	ς	ς	ς	f	αυτου	D
D	αμφιβαλλοντας τα δικτυα	f	(ς)	f	f	f	f	(ς)	βαλλοντας αμφιβληστρον	NBD
K	εις την θαλασσαν	ς	ς	f	f	f	ς	ς	εν τη θαλασση	NBD
NL	17 αλιεις	f	ς	f	f	f	ς	f	γενεσθαι αλιεις	BD
	18 ευθys	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	f	ειθως	NBD
	λινα	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	f	δικτυα	NBD
BDL	19 προβας	f	f	ς	f	f	ς	ς	προβας εκειθεν	ΠΙ
	20 και αφεντες ¹³	(3rd)	ς	(3rd)	ς	ς	ς	ς	και ειθως εκαλεσεν αυτους	NBD
	μισθιων	ς	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	και αφεντες	NBD
	ηλθον	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	μισθων	NB
21 εισπορευται	καφαρναουμ	ς	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	απηλθον	NB
NBL	ειθys	f	ς	f	ς	f	f	f	εισπορευονται	NB
NL	σαββασιν	ς	f	ς	f	ς	f	f	καπερναουμ	AC
D	εδιδασκεν αυτους	f	ς	f	f	f	ς	ς	ειθως	BD
NBL	23 ευθys ην	ς	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	f	σαββασιν εισελθων	BD
NBD	24 τι	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	f	ς	εδιδασκε	NB
D	25 απο του ανθρωπου	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ην	D
									εα, τι	A
									εξ αυτου	NB

⁹ 565 reads και παυτες εξαπτιζοντο.

¹⁰ εν τη ερημω NBDL 83 boh latt. The evidence of fam¹³ is divided.

69 124 read εκει, 13 346 543 788 826 828 read εν τη ερημω. εκει sine addit. is found elsewhere only in syr^{sin} arm and a few late Greek MSS. of which KΠ are the prominent ones.

¹¹ The omission of ο is the K¹ reading, against all other groups.

¹² A unique reading, probably an accident.

¹³ The text is confused: Θ reads και εκαλεσεν αυτους και ειθως αφεντες, 565 και αφεντες, fam¹³ reads και ευθys εκαλεσεν αυτους και ειθως αφεντες. The reading of 565 may be either that of the family or due to homoeoteleuton; in the latter case it seems based on the text of fam¹³. The reading of Θ is an accident, or an attempt to correct to the text of ς by taking out the wrong ευθys.

READINGS OF THE FAMILY			THIRD READING		
	Θ	FAM ¹	FAM ¹³	565	700
D	f	ς	ς	f ¹⁴	f ¹⁴
D	f	ς	ς	ς	ς
D	f	f	f	ς	f
AC 33	f	ς	f	ς	ς
(NB)	f	f	ς	f	(f)
NB (D)	ς	f	ς	f	ς
NBD	f	ς	ς	ς	ς
N 33 boh	f	ς	ς	ς	ς
NBL	f	f	ς	ς	f
(D)	f ¹⁶	f	(ς) ¹⁵	f	f
BD	f	f	f	ς	ς
BD	f	f	f	f	f
LA	ς	f	f	f	f
NBD	ς	ς	f	ς	ς
NB	f	f	ς	ς	ς
BD	ς	ς	ς	f	f
NBD	ς	ς	f	ς	ς
NB	f	f	f	ς	ς
BD	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς
NBD	f ¹⁷	ς	(ς)	f	ς
(D)	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς
N ^o BL boh	f ¹⁸	f	ς	ς	ς
NBD	f	f	f	f	f
B boh	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς

om το πνευμα το ακαθαρτον NB
 εξ NB
 προς αυτους NB
 λεγοντας NBD
 τις διδαχη καλη αυτη (D has variant)
 οτι κατ εξουσιαν
 και τοις πνευμασι NBD
 εηλθε δε NBD
 ακοη αυτου D
 ευθις εις ολην D om
 ευθις
 εκ της συναγωγης εξελθοντες N
 εξελθοντες N
 ηλθον N
 σιμωνος NB
 ευθις (D has variant)
 αυτω περι αυτης NBD
 πυρετος ευθις (D)
 εδυ N
 εφερον NBD
 προς αυτων πατας NBD
 ην post συναγημενη A
 η πολις ολη
 επιστηνημενη NBD
 την θυραν NB
 λαλειν τα δαιμονια NB
 αυτων ND
 ενυυχον
 εηλθε και απηλθεν ND
 απηλθε lat

NB	36	κατεδωξαν	f	ς	ς	f	f	κατεδωξαν	D
DKII		ο τε σιμων	f	f	f	f	f	om τε	σιμων NBL 33
AII	37	σε ζητουσι	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ζητουσι σε	NBD
	38	λεγει	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	και λεγει	NBD
Δ		εληλυθα	(3rd)	ς	f	f	f	εξεληλυθα	D
NBL boh	39	ηλθεν	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ην	εξηλθεν NBCL 33
NBD		εις τας συναγωγας	f	f	f	ς	ς	εν ταις συναγωγαις	NBD
		δαιμονια	f ²⁰	ς	ς	ς	ς	τα δαιμονια	NBD
NL	40	και γουυπετων	f	f	ς	ς	ς	και γουυπετων αυτον	om και γουυπετων BD
D		εαν	(3rd)	ς	ς	f	ς	οτι εαν	κυριε εαν CL boh (B) ²¹
		θελγητς	ς	ς	ς	f	ς	θελγης	NBD
N	41	λεγων	ς	ς	ς	f	f	και λεγει	NBD
NBD		om αυτω	ς	f	ς	f	ς	αυτω	ABD
NBL	42	και	ς	ς	f	ς	ς	και ειποντος αυτου	D
	43	ειθις	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ειθως	NBD
	44	ειπων	ς	ς	ς	f	f	και λεγει	NBD
		ο	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	α	NBD
N	45	δυνασθαι αυτον	ς	ς	ς	ς	f	αυτον δυνασθαι	(D om αυτον)
NCL		εις πολιν φανερως	ς	ς	ς	f	f	φανερως εισελθειν εις	πολιν D
NB		επ ερημοις	ς	ς	f	f	f	εν ερημοις	D
NBD		παντοθεν	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	πανταχοθεν	

¹⁴ So von Soden, but not Belsheim or Hoskier.

¹⁵ Fam¹³ has εθις πανταχου εις ολην. This seems to be a conflation of εθις (found by itself in AD etc ς) and πανταχου (found by itself in no Greek MS. but in b e q boh). But the apparent conflation is found also in BCL.

¹⁶ The reading of Θ may be accidental; but cf. the reading of D εξελθων εκ της συναγωγης, omitting εθις.

¹⁷ May be accidental, but it is the reading of NBD.

¹⁸ Only in D (which has a widely variant text) and in the Latin; perhaps a reminiscence of Lk. 4, 41.

¹⁹ So B, but according to von Soden no other MS.

²⁰ Probably accidental; no other support.

²¹ Note that B has the conflation κυριε οτι εαν. Also von Soden's statements seem inconsistent with Hoskier and the text of Θ, nor is the text of 565 quite certain.

²² και ειπε 28.

and better hybrid of the same type. It would be well worth while for some young scholar to edit a collation of the text of all this group, indicating its affinities with **NB**, **D**, the Old Latin, and the Old Syriac. It would take some months of rather tedious work, but at the end he and we would really know more about the text of the gospels than at present. Meanwhile a tabular collation of the first chapter of Mark will serve to illustrate the facts.²³

In this table the readings on the left are those in which one or more members of the family, viz. Θ fam¹ fam¹³ 28 565 700, depart from the Textus Receptus; the readings on the right are those of the Textus Receptus; the readings of individual MSS. are shown by the symbols 'f' (for 'family') and ς (for the Textus Receptus); on the extreme left and right is shown the evidence of **NBD**, according as they agree with the family or with the Textus Receptus, and in a few cases the pertinent evidence of other MSS. has been added. In the few cases in which a third reading exists, it is given in the right-hand margin, and reference to it in the other columns is indicated by '(3rd).'

The table shows that in Mark i there are 102 variants (a little more than two to each verse) found in one or more of Θ fam¹ fam¹³ 28 565 and 700. A certain deduction may be made from these figures because Θ has 13 singular readings, accredited here to the family, of which the majority are probably only accidents; 565 has only 3 singular readings; fam¹, 4; fam¹³, 1; 28, 2; and 700, 3. The deduction of these yields the figures in the second column below. Even so the result is of course only approximate. The distribution is as follows:

<i>actual figures</i>				<i>corrected figures</i>			
Θ	60 variants from T. R.			47 variants from T. R.			
fam ¹	32	"	"	28	"	"	"
fam ¹³	29	"	"	28	"	"	"
28	35	"	"	33	"	"	"
565	57	"	"	54	"	"	"
700	38	"	"	35	"	"	"

²³ I have been as careful as time would allow, but I make no claim to complete accuracy in this specimen.

The analysis of subsingular readings, that is readings found only in two members of the group, gives some curious results. Θ 700 agree against the others 5 times; Θ 565, 4 times; Θ fam¹³, once fully and twice partially; Θ 28 agree once; and Θ fam¹ not at all. Similarly the combination 565 fam¹ is not found; but 565 fam¹³ is found 5 times, and 565 28, 3 times.

More interesting is naturally the information given by the evidence of **NBD**. D supports the family 30 times, B 35 times. In cases where B and D differ, D supports the family 16 times against B, and B supports it 15 times against D. Moreover in 9 variants the family is supported against both B and D by some or all of the combination **NLA** 33 579, a group which will be recognized as preserving WH's "Alexandrian" text.

These figures show at once that the family is not more closely allied to D than it is to B; von Soden's grouping must be revised in that respect.

With regard to the Koridethi MS. itself the table is sufficient to show that Θ clearly belongs to the same group as fam¹ fam¹³ 28 565 700, and that it contains a noticeably smaller admixture of *K*-readings than any of the other MSS. The problem therefore of its origin is bound up with the problem of the nature of the original text, uninfluenced by *K*, which is distributed among all the members of the group. Once more, before that problem can be properly dealt with, it is necessary to have a complete statement of the facts, similar to the specimen given above, in the form of a collation with *K* and the pertinent evidence of **NBD** latt syr^{sin} syr^{cur} covering all the gospels.

Meanwhile some inkling of what the complete investigation would reveal can be had by using the tables of variants provided in "Codex 1 and its Allies." These tables are there numbered alphabetically A to G, and a comparison with them of the text of Θ gives interesting results.

List A gives the readings in which fam¹ agrees with all other authorities against *K*. In Mark i-iv there are 28 such readings. In 26 of them Θ agrees with fam¹, in one other it has a peculiar reading, in the remaining one it agrees with *K*. This is the same percentage of agreement as in 565, and higher than is found in any other MSS. of the group, for which the figures are:

Non-antiochian readings in fam ¹³	14
" " " " 28	13
" " " " 565	26
" " " " 700	16

In each case a fuller collation would show many more non-antiochian readings in all these MSS.; but the comparison is illusory only in so far as it exaggerates the value of fam¹, and there is little doubt that Θ and 565 have a higher percentage of non-antiochian readings than any other member of the group; in other words they are relatively freer from the influence of *K*.

List E gives the readings in fam¹ found in B but not in *K*, nor in the oldest Western authorities. There are in Mark i-x 20 such readings and for these the figures are as follows:

Readings common to 8 B fam ¹ in Θ	11
" " " " " fam ¹³	6
" " " " " 28	8
" " " " " 565	9
" " " " " 700	6

Again Θ shows both its membership in the group and its high rank.

List D gives Western readings found both in the Old Latin and Old Syriac. Mark i-x shows 31 such readings in fam¹ and the figures are:

Western readings in fam ¹ in Θ	19
" " " " " fam ¹³	8
" " " " " 28	19
" " " " " 565	22
" " " " " 700	15

Either Θ is not quite so good as 565 (although the difference is small) or else there is a special Western strain in the ancestry of 565.

Lists B and C give readings found only in the Old Latin and Old Syriac respectively. The figures here throw rather a different light on Θ. In fam¹ there are 16 Syriac-Western readings in Mark i-x. They are found in the other MSS. as follows:

²⁴ And of these one (γενγεσπων) in Mark vi is not an uncommon reading, and, being found in L Δ boh, may be late Neutral (or "Alexandrian," in the sense of WH).

Syriac-Western readings in fam ¹ in Θ						5
"	"	"	"	"	" fam ¹³	5
"	"	"	"	"	" 28	8
"	"	"	"	"	" 565	6
"	"	"	"	"	" 700	5

In fam¹ there are 29 Latin-Western readings in Mark i-x, and the figures are:

Latin-Western readings in fam ¹ in Θ						15
"	"	"	"	"	" fam ¹³	4
"	"	"	"	"	" 28	12
"	"	"	"	"	" 565	17
"	"	"	"	"	" 700	11

It is certainly curious that Θ should be at the bottom of the list of Old Syriac readings, but back again at the top (except, as usual, for 565) of the list of Old Latin readings. But the figures are so small that it is possible that this is merely an accident. In general it cannot be doubted, in view of the figures, that these manuscripts all represent copies of a common original which has been corrected in different ways in different places to accord with the later *K* text.

To what locality may we suppose that this recension belonged? The only evidence which can be found is derived from considering the localities to which the smaller sub-groups or the individual manuscripts belong, and from the light shed by occasional notes as to the place where their archetype was kept.

1. *The Koridethi MS.* — The palaeographical investigation of the Koridethi Gospels can only be carried out with approximate accuracy on the basis of the Russian edition of the Imperial Moscow Archaeological Society.²⁵ In this publication a facsimile of the page containing the *incipit* of the Gospel of Mark²⁶ is given in natural size, while the folia containing the remainder of the work are shown in reduced magnitude.²⁷

²⁵ Материалы по Археологии Кавказа, издаваемые Графиней Уваровой, Выпускъ X, Москва, 1907; see G. Beermann and C. R. Gregory, *Die Koridethi Evangelien*, Leipzig, 1913, pp. 523-524.

²⁶ Plate I.

²⁷ Plates II-L.

One cannot obtain a proper conception of the general appearance of the codex from the facsimiles in natural size of small sections of various leaves contained in Gregory and Beermann's edition.²⁸ The photostatic prints of the whole MS. brought back from Tiflis by Mrs. R. P. Blake, now in the J. Pierpont Morgan Collection of the Harvard College Library, are likewise reduced in the ratio of 1:1.6. In a palaeographical analysis the individual peculiarities of the letters may be studied by regarding them in enlarged or in reduced size, but a general impression (which is after all the main point) can only be obtained from photographs which reproduce the pages of the manuscript as they meet the eye of the observer.

The general impression received from an inspection of the original of Codex Θ is that of heaviness and coarseness, both in script and in material.²⁹ Unmistakable likewise is the uncertainty displayed by the scribe in the delineation and formation of the individual letters. Another unquestionable point is the strong external similarity of the script to that of Coptic codices.

In Gregory's painstaking study of the script³⁰ we have a most elaborate palaeographical investigation, which, though thorough in the highest degree, is unilluminating. All his remarks and observations, whether slight or important, are thrown together with so little system that it is impossible, as they stand, to see their relative significance. We will therefore extract those points which seem significant. In the first place, the scribe did not *write*, but *drew*, his letters.³¹ This observation explains the difficulty he experienced in keeping to the proper size for the different characters,³² the tendency he evinces to run beyond or above the incised line,³³ and the clumsy execution of some of the letters.³⁴ A number of the errors met with

²⁸ Plates II-XI.

²⁹ Dr. Blake examined the MS. repeatedly during his stay in Tiflis (July 1918-May 1920).

³⁰ Beermann and Gregory, pp. 599 f.

³¹ Gregory, though noting this point (cf. Beermann and Gregory, pp. 600, 607), does not seem to grasp its importance.

³² Facsimile, plate I, col. 2, l. 13.

³³ Ibid., passim.

³⁴ Especially M.

in the MS. are of a type which seems to point to the fact that the scribe was not accustomed from childhood to catch Greek words with his eye and to hold them.³⁵ We see, for instance, such errors as Matt. 5, 11 *ηυμων*; Matt. 9, 22 *σεσωκαιεν*; Matt. 16, 26 *καιερδηση*. [But these mistakes may also be due to inability to understand corrections. They seem to be conflateions of corrected itacisms. Compare the somewhat similar phenomena in Cod. 118, though here the scribe understood the question, and left blank spaces instead of conflating alternatives (see "Codex 1 and its Allies," pp. xxxvii-xxxix).]

The individual weight of the facts mentioned above, if taken separately, is not very great. Their combined moment is considerable. It is difficult to explain them all without the hypothesis of an intelligent foreigner, who knew some but not much Greek — just enough to read the archetype of our codex and to copy it more or less slavishly.³⁶

Further evidence in support of this hypothesis can be deduced from an examination of the types of the letters in the MS. With this in view an alphabetic table is subjoined of the various types of letters in the MS., with which in parallel columns are compared similar collections taken from Cod. Borg. copt. 109 (s. vi)³⁷ and from Cod. Vat. gr. 1666 (a. 800).³⁸ A glance at these alphabets will show that the alphabet employed by the scribe of Θ is an *eclectic* one. Those letters which Gregory most wonders at, A K X,³⁹ appear in Vat. 1666, while most of the other letters approximate the forms of those of the "Coptic" text. The general ductus of the script is that of the Coptic, with broad strokes and rounded curves and the broader letters inscribable in squares, as opposed to the sharp angles and dashed-in lines of varying length in the Italian MS.

³⁵ A convenient list of classified errata is contained in von Soden's remarks, pp. VIII-X of Russian edition.

³⁶ Beermann and Gregory had inklings of this, but do not carry out their train of reasoning to the end (p. 607).

³⁷ P. Franchi de' Cavalieri and H. Lietzmann, *Specimina Codicum Vaticanorum Graecorum*, Bonn, 1910, plate 3.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, plate 6.

³⁹ Beermann and Gregory, pp. 614-615, 625.

We thus see before us an eclectic hand, uncertain in its chirographic manner, and presumably to a certain extent dependent on its archetype.⁴⁰ This again would tend to confirm the hypothesis that the scribe's Greek is not his mother tongue.

The question of the date of the MS., an answer to which must come from the various adscriptions rather than from palaeographical considerations, has been carefully studied by Beermann.⁴¹ It is highly unlikely that his earlier alternative date (the reign of the emperor Heraclius) for the Greek adscription on f. 249b can be accepted.⁴² Not only is it hard to believe that the MS. dates from a period as early as the end of the sixth century,⁴³ but furthermore it by no means follows that the MS. was written at Maiferrukat. We merely learn that it happened to be in that district in the ninth century.⁴⁴ Moreover Marr's study of the Georgian adscriptions shows that the majority of them belong to the thirteenth and not to the tenth century.⁴⁵

The extreme importance of the picaresque inscription on the inner side of the back cover has not been sufficiently appreciated.⁴⁶ We have here a *mélange* of Georgian and Coptic letters, and one Coptic word, viz. *hēppe* (ἰδοῦ).⁴⁷ Oscar von Lemm is right in holding that Armenian letters are not present. Now the very appearance of Coptic letters is an important and significant fact. It points to a connection with Egypt or with those districts immediately contiguous with it — Sinai and Palestine.⁴⁸ The inscription, to be sure, is on the inner side of the cover (on the parchment or on the wood?), but it seems to go back to a high antiquity, and very possibly may have been copied from the original codex.

⁴⁰ I doubt if this be true to the extent that Gregory thinks (Beermann and Gregory, p. 607).

⁴¹ Beermann and Gregory, pp. 569–581.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 577.

⁴³ Among other things, the coarseness of the material speaks against this.

⁴⁴ Beerman practically admits this (p. 580).

⁴⁵ Н. Я. Марр, Грузинскія Приписки Коридетскаго Евангелія. ИАН, 1911, стр. 211–240.

⁴⁶ Beermann and Gregory, pp. 583–584.

⁴⁷ See O. von Lemm, ИАН 1911, стр. 458–459.

⁴⁸ On the stay-at-homeness of Coptic, cf. P. Peeters, Traductions et traducteurs dans l'hagiographie orientale, Acta Bollandiana 40, 1922, p. 246.

Θ	Borg. copt. 109	Vat. gr. 1666	Θ	Borg. copt. 109	Vat. gr. 1666
Α	Α	Α	Ν	Ν	Ν
Β	Β	Β	Ξ	Ξ	Ξ
Γ	Γ	Γ	Ο	Ο	Ο
Δ	Δ	Δ	Π	Π	Π
Ε	Ε	Ε	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ
Ζ	Ζ	Ζ	Σ	Σ	Σ
Η	Η	Η	Τ	Τ	Τ
Θ	Θ	Θ	Υ	Υ	Υ
Ι	Ι	Ι	Φ	Φ	Φ
Κ	Κ	Κ	Χ	Χ	Χ
Λ	Λ	Λ	Ψ	Ψ	Ψ
Μ	Μ	Μ	Ω	Ω	Ω

Connections between Georgians and Egyptians had been established at an early date; and the late Oscar von Lemm, the Coptic scholar, shed much light on this matter in two very brilliant articles some years since.⁴⁹ In addition we find Georgian settlements in Palestine from a very early period, and also on Mt. Sinai. These have been investigated in the book of Professor A. A. Tsagareli, "Monuments of Georgian Antiquities in the Holy Land and on Sinai."⁵⁰ Jerusalem, the laura of St. Sabba, and the Black Mountain near Antioch formed the chief centres of Georgian monastic settlement in Palestine during the middle ages.⁵¹ The earliest definite evidence for the existence of a Georgian colony in the Holy Land goes back to the time of Justinian, when we find a monastery of the Lazoi in Jerusalem.⁵² The existence of Georgian (as well as Armenian) inmates in the monastery of St. Sabba is attested by the typikon of St. Sabba (ed. Dimitrievski, pp. 222-223).⁵³ On the other hand, the importance of Palestinian influence in Georgia is sufficiently attested by numerous sources. The prevailing liturgy in that country until the eleventh century was that of St. James of Jerusalem.⁵⁴ To this day the churches of Swanetia exhibit peculiarities which undoubtedly took their rise from Palestinian models.⁵⁵ St. Gregory of Khandzt'a, the Georgian Apostle of Tao-Klardjet'ia,⁵⁶ sent a special envoy to St. Sabba to get the true text of the typikon of St. Sabba. Hilarion the Georgian went thither on his first pilgrimage.⁵⁷

⁴⁹ O. von Lemm, *Zur Bekehrung der Iberer zum Christentum*, *Kleine koptische Studien* LX (ИАН 10 [1899], 403 ff.): *Iberica* (Записки Имп. Акад. Наукъ, фил. ист. кл. Сер. viii, Томъ 7, No. 6, 1906).

⁵⁰ А. А. Цагарели, *Памятники грузинской старины въ Святой Землѣ и на Синаѣ*. Сборникъ Имп. Палест. Общества, Выпускъ 10. Спб. 1888 г.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 27 f.

⁵² Procopius, *de aed.* 5, 9, 6-7 (III, 2, 164, 16-17 Haurey).

⁵³ Киевъ 1895. This reference is taken from К. Кекелидзе, *Иерусалимскій Канонарь vii вѣка*, Тифлисъ, 1912, стр. 34-35.

⁵⁴ Кекелидзе, *l.c.*, p. 33, cf. his *Древнегрузинскій Архіератиконъ*, Тифлихъ, 1912, стр. ix-xiv.

⁵⁵ Кекелидзе, *Иер. Канонарь*, p. 1, note 2.

⁵⁶ Н. Марръ, *Житіе св. Григорія Хандзт'ійскаго*, Спб. 1911 (TP VII), text 12, 50-53, translation 97, 47-50.

⁵⁷ See (P. Peeters), *Acta Bollandiana*, 32, 1913, pp. 236 f. (St. Ilarion d'Ibérie).

The importance of Palestine as a centre of influence for Georgia was enhanced by the iconoclast movement in Constantinople, which directed into the domains of the Caliphate the stream of pilgrims that under other circumstances would naturally have gravitated to the *σεβάσιμοι τόποι* of Byzantium, and the connection with Palestine remained vital and active long after the establishment of normal relations with the Greek empire. We are less well-informed regarding the Georgian colony on Mt. Sinai, but its existence is attested in the ninth century.⁵⁸

Now the occurrence of an adscription in Coptic, a language but little known outside of Egypt, naturally causes us to look to Sinai rather than Palestine as the place whence our codex takes its origin. It is true that the evidence is far from conclusive, but there is a certain amount of it. As we have shown above, the scribe was not a Greek by birth, and presumably only partially so by education. Accordingly it would seem that the almost unique combination in a single codex of Greek, Georgian, and Coptic elements, taken together with the palaeographical testimony, makes it possible to localize the Koridethi MS. on Mt. Sinai. Where else would there have been a scribe, writing Greek in a quasi-Coptic hand, whose work was subsequently annotated by Georgians?

2. *Fam*¹. None of the manuscripts of *fam*¹ so far edited belong palaeographically to South Italy and all of them may well be Constantinopolitan. Codex 1 seems to have used the same arrangement of symbols for the evangelists as did Anastasius of Sinai, but this is, of course, not a point of great importance.

Since the text of Codex 1 was published I have had the opportunity of studying another manuscript of this group which is now in the library of Vatopedi on Mt. Athos. It is much the oldest manuscript of the family, though it does not seem to represent a noticeably better text than Codex 1; indeed I doubt if it is as good as Codex 1. A complete set of photographs of this manuscript is now in the Harvard College Library and a definite report on the subject may be expected soon. But it is an interesting fact that, unless I am much mistaken, the scribe

⁵⁸ See P. Peeters, *Acta Bollandiana*, 40, 1922, pp. 282-283.

of this manuscript, named Ephraim, is identical with the scribe of the now famous MS. Athos, Laura B 64 (Gregory 1739; α 78) generally known as von der Goltz's codex, and containing extracts from lost commentaries of Origen. I am disposed to guess that the text of fam¹ and that of von der Goltz's manuscript (or possibly of its archetype ?) represent a recension of the whole New Testament made by some unknown scholar; but I fear that von der Goltz's argument that this text originally belonged to a manuscript of much earlier date breaks down. He may be right in fact, but his palaeographical argument is fallacious, for the readings upon which it rests prove on closer examination to be misreadings of the manuscript.

One other point may perhaps be made, though it certainly ought not to be pressed, in connection with this family. The script of Ephraim is not unlike that of the Arethas manuscripts, which come from Caesarea; it is not inconceivable that there is some connection between the two.

3. *The Ferrar group.* Of this family all the codices (except 69, which is late) come from Calabria, but none is earlier than the twelfth century (*pace* von Soden) and nothing is known certainly as to the provenance of their archetype.

4. *Codices 28, 565, and 700.* No evidence enables us to fix the origin of 28 or of 700, but 565 (also known as 2^{pe}), which came from Houmish Khan in Pontus,⁵⁹ has an important colophon at the end of Mark, to the effect that it was written and copied from Jerusalem codices.⁶⁰ Some other manuscripts containing this colophon (with, however, a different gospel text) add that these Jerusalem codices were "on the holy mountain." It has been too lightly assumed by most investigators of the New Testament that this holy mountain means Mt. Zion, in other words, that the Jerusalem manuscripts were still in Jerusalem when these words of the colophon were first written. I protested against this interpretation in my "Texts from Mt. Athos" (1902), and am more than ever convinced that the

⁵⁹ It was given to Czar Nicholas in 1829 by the Metropolitan Sylvester, who states that tradition connects it with the Empress Theodora.

⁶⁰ It runs, according to Belsheim (p. 5): *εγραφη και αντεβληθη ομοιως εκ των ιεροσολυμων παλαιων αντιγραφον*. Doubtless it is accentuated, but Belsheim always omits accents.

colophon must mean that the manuscripts which had come from Jerusalem were on the holy mountain of Sinai. I do not think that at the time of writing there was any other place to which "the holy mountain" could refer.

Thus the conclusions to which all the facts are, at least, not opposed can be summarized as follows:

(1) All these manuscripts, or groups of manuscripts, represent mixtures of the same 'family-text' with the Antiochian text.

(2) The two manuscripts which have preserved the greatest amount of the 'family-text' and the least admixture of the Antiochian text are Θ and 565.

(3) The ingredients in Θ and 565 — the 'family-text' and the Antiochian text — are the same, but they are differently mixed; therefore historical factors which have affected both Θ and 565, and are not derived from the Antiochian text, belong to the history of the 'family-text.'

(4) Both Θ and 565 are connected with Jerusalem and Sinai, Θ by its palaeographical history, and 565 by the colophon to Mark, and in view of (3) this connection must be inferred to belong to the 'family-text.'

(5) The 'family-text' is itself a combination of Western and Neutral readings. Most, though not all, of the great Western interpolations are absent, but there are about as many Western readings of the less striking type as there are Neutral readings. In its original form this text was probably not influenced at all by the *K*-text, but it may be parallel to that recension, in that it is a combination of the two earlier types. To go further is certainly hazardous, but three topics for further investigation may be indicated. First, if we ask how an early text came to be in Jerusalem, the natural suggestion would be the library of Alexander, which was for Jerusalem what the library of Pamphilus was for Caesarea. Secondly, if we assume that Sinai was the place where the Jerusalem manuscripts were used, and combined with another type, the natural view would be that the Neutral manuscripts came from Egypt and the other type from Jerusalem. Thirdly, Professor F. C. Burkitt has pointed out in "The Old Latin and the Itala" that, though there is a

close connection between the Old Latin and the Old Syriac, there is in the Gospels one set of interpolations characteristic of the Old Latin and another set characteristic of the Old Syriac. It may be added that the same thing is true of "non-interpolations." There is therefore special interest attaching to any evidence for the existence of a Western text, such as is incorporated in the 'family-text' of Θ and its allies, which seems to have missed so many interpolations. Is this partial freedom from interpolation a primitive characteristic, or is it due to correction?

BOOKS RECEIVED

- FIVE MINUTES WITH THE BOYS' AND GIRLS' CONGREGATION.** *By William H. Walker.* New York, Fleming H. Revell Company, 1923. Pp. 160. \$1.25.
- OUTLINES OF A PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE.** *By Alban G. Widgery.* London, Williams and Norgate, 1923. Pp. xxiv, 316. 7s. 6d.
- THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RELIGIONS: A SYSTEMATIC SURVEY.** *By Alban G. Widgery.* London, Williams and Norgate, 1923. Pp. xxii, 391. 12s. 6d.
- THE UNVEILING OF THE FALL.** *By C. W. Formby.* London, Williams and Norgate, 1923. Pp. xxiii, 187.
- SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY: THE BASES OF BEHAVIOUR CALLED SOCIAL.** *By Robert H. Gault.* New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1923. Pp. x, 336. \$2.50.
- ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION OF RELIGION.** *By E. Washburn Hopkins.* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1923. Pp. 370. \$3.00.
- LOS VON WELLHAUSEN: EIN BEITRAG ZUR NEUORIENTIERUNG IN DER ALTTESTAMENTLICHEN WISSENSCHAFT.** *By Martin Kegel.* Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1923. Pp. 70.
- CHRISTIANITY AND LIBERALISM.** *By J. Gresham Machen.* New York, The Macmillan Company, 1923. Pp. 188.
- NEW TESTAMENT GREEK FOR BEGINNERS.** *By J. Gresham Machen.* New York, The Macmillan Co., 1923. Pp. xii, 285. \$2.20.
- HEAVEN AND HELL IN COMPARATIVE RELIGION WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DANTE'S DIVINE COMEDY.** *By Kaufmann Kohler.* New York, The Macmillan Company, 1923. Pp. xix, 158.
- THE APOSTLE PAUL AND THE MODERN WORLD.** *By Francis Greenwood Peabody.* New York, The Macmillan Company, 1923. Pp. x, 285.
- DIE LEBENDIGKEIT DER RELIGION.** *By Otto Hofmann.* Heidelberg, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1923. Pp. 217.
- DIE KULTURWERTE DER DEUTSCHEN LITERATUR VON DER REFORMATION BIS ZUR AUFKLÄRUNG.** *By Kuno Francke.* Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1923. Pp. xiv, 638.
- L'UNITÉ DANS LE CHRIST.** *By Michel d'Herbigny, S. J.* Rome, Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1923. Pp. 32.
- FRA PAOLO SARPI.** *By Aristarco Fasulo.* Rome, Casa Editrice-Bilychnis.
- INTRODUCTION AU NOUVEAU TESTAMENT. TOME I. LES ÉVANGILES SYNOPTIQUES.** *By Maurice Goguel.* Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1923. Pp. 532.
- PSALMENSTUDIEN. I. AWAN UND DIE INDIVIDUELLEN KLAGESALMEN.** *By Sigmund Mowinckel.* Kristiania, Jacob Dybwad, 1921. Pp. vi, 181.
- PSALMENSTUDIEN. II. DAS THRONBESTEIGUNGSFEST JAHWAS UND DER URSPRUNG DER ESCHATOLOGIE.** *By Sigmund Mowinckel.* Kristiania, Jacob Dybwad, 1922. Pp. xvi, 347.
- THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES IN THE REVISED VERSION WITH INTRODUCTION AND COMMENTARY.** *By A. W. F. Blunt.* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1922. Pp. 272.

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

- SOME ASPECTS OF CONTEMPORARY GREEK ORTHODOX THOUGHT. *By Frank Gavin.* Milwaukee, Morehouse Publishing Company; London, A. R. Mowbray and Company, 1923. Pp. xxxiv, 430.
- STUDIES IN BIBLICAL PARALLELISM. PART III. PARALLELISM IN ISAIAH. *By William Popper.* Berkeley, California, University of California Press, 1923. Pp. 345-551.
- BABYLONIAN WISDOM. *By S. Langdon.* London, Luzac and Co.; Paris, Paul Geuthner, 1923. Pp. 103.
- DAS BUCH IESAIA, ÜBERSETZT UND ERKLÄRT. *By Bernhard Duhm.* Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1923. Pp. 490.
- DAS DEUTERONOMIUM, ÜBERSETZT UND ERKLÄRT. *By Carl Steuernagel.* Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1923. Pp. 83.
- DIE AUFGABE DER WISSENSCHAFT VOM CHRISTLICHEN GLAUBEN IN DER GEGENWART. *By Oskar Pfister.* Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1923. Pp. 48.
- JOHN TOLAND'S CHRISTIANITY NOT MYSTERIOUS (CHRISTENTUM OHNE GEHEIMNIS) 1696. Übersetzt von W. Lunde. Eingeleitet und, unter Beifügung von Leibnizens Annotatiunculæ 1701, herausgegeben von Leopold Zscharnack. Giessen, Alfred Töpelmann, 1908. Pp. vii, 148.
- JOHN LOCKE'S REASONABLENESS OF CHRISTIANITY (VERNÜNFTIGKEIT DES BIBLISCHEN CHRISTENTUMS) 1695. Übersetzt von C. Winckler, mit einer Einleitung herausgegeben von Leopold Zscharnack. Giessen, Alfred Töpelmann, 1914. Pp. lxvi, 140.
- DIE EDDALIEDER, KLANGLICH UNTERSUCHT UND HERAUSGEGEBEN. *By Eduard Sievers.* Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1923. Pp. 188.
- DIE WELTANSCHAUUNG GUSTAV THEODOR FECHNERS. *By Heinrich Adolph.* Stuttgart, Strecker und Schröder, 1923. Pp. xi, 171.
- LICHT VOM OSTEN: DAS NEUE TESTAMENT UND DIE NEUENTDECKTEN TEXTE DER HELLENISTISCH-RÖMISCHEN WELT. Vierte, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage. *By Adolf Deissmann.* Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1923. Pp. xviii, 447. \$3.60 (bound \$4.80).
- FIVE CENTURIES OF RELIGION. VOL. I, ST. BERNARD, HIS PREDECESSORS AND SUCCESSORS, 1000-1200 A.D. *By G. G. Coulton.* Cambridge, University Press, 1923. Pp. xlv, 578. 30s.